



Independent Colleges and Student Engagement:

Descriptive Analysis by Institutional Type

By Robert M. Gonyea and Jillian Kinzie

A REPORT FOR



THE COUNCIL OF
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

About the CIC Research Agenda

This is the second in a series of research reports prepared as components of two major initiatives of the Council of Independent Colleges—the public information campaign, *Securing America's Future: The Power of Liberal Arts Education*, and the Project on the Future of Independent Higher Education.

The public information campaign promotes the effectiveness and contributions of private liberal arts colleges and universities and the importance of the liberal arts as fields of study. In addition to this report, the campaign includes a website with related news, social media activity, data and analyses, editorials, speeches, alumni testimonials, and additional reports. Generous support for the campaign is provided by Arthur Vining Davis Foundations, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Endeavor Foundation, Jessie Ball DuPont Fund, Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, and Teagle Foundation.

The Project on the Future of Independent Higher Education is a multi-year initiative to identify and examine the forces that are most likely to affect the future of independent colleges and universities and to help member institutions prepare for both new challenges and new opportunities. With the guidance of a steering committee of college and university presidents (see last page), the project considers potentially disruptive changes to American society and explores fresh approaches to higher education and new college business models. The project also examines the distinctive characteristics and missions of independent colleges that have enabled them to offer a high-quality education for so many years. The project is supported by the Lumina Foundation for Education and the TIAA-CREF Institute.

Other Reports in This Series

Expanding Access and Opportunity (March 2015)

Research Reports on the future of independent higher education may be downloaded from www.cic.edu/ResearchFuture.

Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Descriptive Analysis by Institutional Type

*A 2015 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Special Analysis for the Council of Independent Colleges*

Robert M. Gonyea and Jillian Kinzie
June 2015

Center for Postsecondary Research
Indiana University School of Education
nsse@indiana.edu
812.856.5824

Copyright © 2015 Council of Independent Colleges

The **Council of Independent Colleges** (CIC) is an association of 750 nonprofit independent colleges and universities and higher education affiliates and organizations that has worked since 1956 to support college and university leadership, advance institutional excellence, and enhance public understanding of private higher education's contributions to society. CIC is the major national organization that focuses on providing services to leaders of independent colleges and universities as well as conferences, seminars, and other programs that help institutions improve educational quality, administrative and financial performance, and institutional visibility. CIC conducts the largest annual conference of college and university presidents. CIC also provides support to state fundraising associations that organize programs and generate contributions for private colleges and universities. The Council is headquartered at One Dupont Circle in Washington, DC. For more information, visit www.cic.edu.

About the Authors

Robert M. Gonyea is associate director of research and data analysis at the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, where he coordinates research and reporting for the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and associated projects. **Jillian Kinzie** is associate director of the Center for Postsecondary Research and NSSE Institute and coordinates NSSE Institute project activities.

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Data	5
Variables	5
Engagement Indicators	5
How Students Assess Their Experience	7
Additional Items	7
High-Impact Practices	7
Analysis	7
Interpreting Results	7
Results	9
Summary of Findings	9
<i>Private Compared with Public</i>	9
<i>BA/MA Privates Compared with Other Carnegie/Control Groups</i>	9
Results for Engagement Indicators and Component Items	12
<i>Higher-Order Learning</i>	12
<i>Reflective & Integrative Learning</i>	12
<i>Quantitative Reasoning</i>	13
<i>Learning Strategies</i>	13
<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	13
<i>Discussions with Diverse Others</i>	13
<i>Student-Faculty Interaction</i>	13
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>	13
<i>Quality of Interactions</i>	14
<i>Supportive Environment</i>	14
How Students Assess Their Experiences	14
<i>Perceived Gains</i>	14
<i>Satisfaction</i>	15
Additional Items	15
High-Impact Practices	15
Conclusion	16
References	17
Appendix	18
Appendix A: NSSE 2013 and 2014 Participating Institutions by Carnegie/Control Groups	18
Appendix B: Frequencies by Institutional Control—First-Year Students	22
Appendix C: Frequencies by Institutional Control—Seniors	29
Appendix D: Statistical Comparisons by Institutional Control—First-Year Students	36
Appendix E: Statistical Comparisons by Institutional Control—Seniors	40
Appendix F: Frequencies by Carnegie/Control Groups—First-Year Students	44
Appendix G: Frequencies by Carnegie/Control Groups—Seniors	51
Appendix H: Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Comparisons by Carnegie/Control Groups—First-Year Students	58
Appendix I: Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Comparisons by Carnegie/Control Groups—Seniors	66
Appendix J: Results for High-Impact Practices	74

Executive Summary

Critics of traditional, residential, liberal arts colleges and universities contend that this form of higher education is outmoded, too costly, and no longer educationally relevant for 21st century students. Economies of scale, large classes taught by contingent faculty members and graduate students, and increasing reliance on technology and online learning, so the argument goes, are the only cost-effective means of meeting the educational challenges of the future. Building on a half century of research, this report draws recent evidence from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to demonstrate that students at private colleges and universities are engaged in their education much more than students at public institutions. Areas of distinction in the private institution undergraduate experience include a more academically challenging education, better relations with faculty members, more substantial interactions with others on campus, and the consistent perception that students have learned and grown more, in comparison with public institutions.

This report, prepared for the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), draws on the most current NSSE data, from 2013 and 2014, that include more than 540,000 first-year and senior students enrolled at more than 900 four-year colleges and universities. Findings are presented with comparisons across four institutional types: (1) baccalaureate and master's level private institutions (CIC's predominant membership profile), (2) baccalaureate and master's level public institutions, (3) doctoral private institutions, and (4) doctoral public institutions. Included in the analysis are measures from the updated NSSE that includes ten new Engagement Indicators, six High-Impact Practices, the Perceived Gains scale, and a Satisfaction scale.

Many findings demonstrate the value and utility of the education offered by small and mid-sized private colleges and universities, especially when compared with public institutions:

- *Academically Challenging Experiences*: Private college students are more likely to experience courses that emphasize higher-order learning and reflective and integrative learning experiences as well as studying, writing, and reading.
- *Student-Faculty Interactions*: First-year and senior students at private colleges are more likely to interact with faculty members about their academic performance, course topics outside of class, co- and extra-curricular activities, and career plans after graduation.
- *Effective Teaching Practices*: Students at small, independent colleges report greater satisfaction with course organization, course lectures, and feedback on course assignments.
- *High-Impact Practices*: Private college students experienced more educational practices that result in greater gains in student learning and higher levels of persistence, including service learning, research conducted with a faculty member, internships and field experiences, study abroad, and culminating senior experiences. Moreover, students at private colleges are more likely than their peers at public institutions to participate in two or more High-Impact Practices.
- *Supportive Learning Environment*: Students enrolled at private colleges are more likely to report that their institutions provided support that helped them succeed and that they attended events that addressed important social, economic, or political issues.
- *Emphasis on Values and Ethics*: Both first-year students and seniors who enrolled at private colleges are more likely to perceive that they made greater strides in developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics.

In sum, findings from this study affirm the effectiveness of independent colleges and universities for undergraduate student learning. Students at private institutions are more likely to be engaged in educationally effective experiences than their peers at public institutions. These findings update and reaffirm what has been previously demonstrated: that the traditional, residential, liberal arts college provides a more effective learning environment for today's students.

Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Descriptive Analysis by Institutional Type

This study was undertaken at the request of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) to update the June 2009 CIC special report titled “Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Descriptive Analysis by Institutional Type” (BrckaLorenz, Ribera, & Gonyea, 2009). The purpose is to provide evidence for “making the case” for independent higher education. The 2009 report was itself an update of “Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Do Religious Affiliation and Institutional Type Matter?” (Kuh & Gonyea, 2006) and of “Benchmark Scale Analyses Prepared for the Council of Independent Colleges” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004), all of which examined differences in engagement for students at private and public institutions.

The present report draws on NSSE data from 2013 and 2014, including more than 540,000 students enrolled at more than 900 baccalaureate institutions (Appendix A). While the analytical approach is generally the same, the current report differs in one very important aspect. It incorporates measures from the updated NSSE (launched in 2013), including NSSE’s ten new Engagement Indicators, six High-Impact Practices, the Perceived Gains scale, and a Satisfaction scale.

Data

Respondents in the dataset consisted of approximately 232,022 first-year students and 318,067 seniors who were randomly selected from 905 US institutions that participated in NSSE in either 2013 or 2014. Almost two-thirds of the students were female, and 9% were African American, 4% Asian/Pacific Islander, 65% Caucasian/White, and 10% Hispanic. The majority of these students were enrolled full-time (89%) and twenty-three years old or younger (77%). A larger percentage of these students were studying for degrees in business (15%), health professions (14%), social sciences (13%), and arts and humanities (10%), while fewer students were studying physical sciences, mathematics, or computer science (5%), social service professions (5%), and communications, media, or public relations (4%).

As in the previous reports, in addition to institutions being identified as public or private, institutions were assigned to four categories for analysis, representing a combination of Carnegie type and control. The four resulting Carnegie/Control categories are:

1. Baccalaureate and Masters (BA/MA) private institutions
(CIC’s predominant membership profile)
2. Baccalaureate and Masters (BA/MA) public institutions
3. Doctoral private institutions
4. Doctoral public institutions

Within the present study, over half (53%) of the institutions were categorized as BA/MA Privates, and about three in ten were BA/MA Publics (29%). The Public Doctoral institutions represented about 13% of institutions, and Private Doctoral institutions were the fewest at 6%. See Appendix A for the list of NSSE institutions within each of these four categories.

Variables

This analysis incorporates measures from the updated NSSE, including NSSE’s ten new Engagement Indicators (and their component items), six High-Impact Practices, additional items about academic challenge, the Perceived Gains scale (and component items), and a Satisfaction scale (with component items). In all, the list of variables includes 78 aspects of student engagement and effective educational practice.

Engagement Indicators

To represent the multi-dimensional nature of student engagement at national, sector, institutional, and intra-institutional levels, NSSE developed ten Engagement Indicators. Each Engagement Indicator (EI) provides valuable information about a distinct aspect of student engagement by summarizing students’ responses to a set of related survey questions. Detailed descriptions of each indicator and component items are below.

<i>Engagement Indicator Description</i>	
Higher-Order Learning	Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by calling on students to engage in complex cognitive tasks requiring more than mere memorization of facts. This EI captures how much students' coursework emphasizes challenging cognitive tasks such as application, analysis, judgment, and synthesis.
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Personally connecting with course material requires students to relate their understandings and experiences to the content at hand. Instructors emphasizing reflective and integrative learning motivate students to make connections between their learning and the world around them, reexamining their own beliefs and considering issues and ideas from others' perspectives.
Learning Strategies	College students enhance their learning and retention by actively engaging with and analyzing course material rather than approaching learning as absorption. Examples of effective learning strategies include identifying key information in readings, reviewing notes after class, and summarizing course material. Knowledge about the prevalence of effective learning strategies helps colleges and universities target interventions to promote student learning and success.
Quantitative Reasoning	Quantitative literacy—the ability to use and understand numerical and statistical information in everyday life—is an increasingly important outcome of higher education. All students, regardless of major, should have ample opportunities to develop their ability to reason quantitatively—to evaluate, support, and critique arguments using numerical and statistical information.
Collaborative Learning	Collaborating with peers in solving problems or mastering difficult material deepens understanding and prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they encounter during and after college. Working on group projects, asking others for help with difficult material or explaining it to others, and working through course material in preparation for exams all represent collaborative learning activities.
Discussions with Diverse Others	Colleges and universities afford students new opportunities to interact with and learn from others with different backgrounds and life experiences. Interactions across difference, both inside and outside the classroom, confer educational benefits and prepare students for personal and civic participation in a diverse and interdependent world.
Student-Faculty Interaction	Interactions with faculty can positively influence the cognitive growth, development, and persistence of college students. Through their formal and informal roles as teachers, advisors, and mentors, faculty model intellectual work, promote mastery of knowledge and skills, and help students make connections between their studies and their future plans.
Effective Teaching Practices	Student learning is heavily dependent on effective teaching. Organized instruction, clear explanations, illustrative examples, and effective feedback on student work all represent aspects of teaching effectiveness that promote student comprehension and learning.
Quality of Interactions	College environments characterized by positive interpersonal relations promote student learning and success. Students who enjoy supportive relationships with peers, advisors, faculty, and staff are better able to find assistance when needed, and to learn from and with those around them.
Supportive Environment	Institutions that are committed to student success provide support and involvement across a variety of domains, including the cognitive, social, and physical. These commitments foster higher levels of student performance and satisfaction. This EI summarizes students' perceptions of how much an institution emphasizes services and activities that support their learning and development.

Each EI is expressed on a 60-point scale. Computing EI scores involves three steps. First, all items that contribute to an EI are converted to a 60-point scale. For example, items with four response options (e.g., Never, Sometimes, Often, and Very often) are recoded with values of 0, 20, 40, and 60. Second, recoded values for each component item are averaged together. Finally, institutional EI scores are the averages of the student-level scores for each class level. For descriptive analysis, the EI scores were divided into terciles (three roughly equal groups) using the aggregate data, so frequency results show the percentage of students in the lowest third, middle third, and highest third.

How Students Assess Their Experience

Students' perceptions of their cognitive and affective development, as well as their overall satisfaction with the institution, provide useful evidence of their educational experiences. These two scales are calculated on a 60-point scale using the same method as the EIs, and were also divided into terciles for the frequency analysis.

Additional Scale	Description
Perceived Gains	Students reported how much their experience at their institution contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in ten areas: writing clearly and effectively, speaking clearly and effectively, thinking critically and analytically, analyzing numerical and statistical information, acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills, working effectively with others, developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics, understanding people of other backgrounds, solving complex real-world problems, and being an informed and active citizen.
Satisfaction with the Institution	Students rated their overall experience at the institution, and whether or not they would choose it again.

Additional Items

In addition, this analysis focused on seven aspects of the student experience thought to be important:

Variable Name	Description	Response Values/Coding
Time spent preparing for class	Average hours per week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	Estimated hours, recoded using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options.
Time spent on reading	Of the time students spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how much is on assigned reading? (2014 institutions only)	Estimated hours, multiplying the original item by a proportion as follows: Very little=.10; Some=.25; About half=.50; Most=.75; Almost all=.90
Average pages of assigned writing	Estimate of the number of pages students were asked to write in coursework	Estimated pages, recoding and summing the original items using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options
Perceived challenge of courses	Extent students' courses challenged them to do their best work	Seven point anchored scale ranging from 1 = "Not at all" to 7 = "Very much"
Institutional emphasis on academic work	Institutional emphasis on spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Very Much, Quite a Bit, Some, Very Little
Quality of interactions with students	Ratings of students' interactions with other students at the institution	Seven point anchored scale ranging from 1 = "Poor" to 7 = "Excellent" (Results also part of the Quality of Interactions EI)
Perceived gains—values and ethics	To what extent has the students' experience at their institution contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas: developing a personal code of values and ethics?	Very Much, Quite a Bit, Some, Very Little (Results also part of the Perceived Gains scale)

High-Impact Practices

Due to their positive associations with student learning and retention, certain undergraduate opportunities are designated "high-impact." High-Impact Practices (HIPs) share several traits: They demand considerable time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and

provide frequent and substantive feedback. As a result, participation in these practices can be life-changing (Kuh, 2008). NSSE founding director George Kuh recommends that institutions should aspire for all students to participate in at least two HIPs over the course of their undergraduate experience—one during the first year and one in the context of their major (NSSE, 2007).

NSSE asks students about their participation in the six HIPs shown in the table below. This report provides information on the first three for first-year students and all six for seniors, and also calculates two summary measures which indicate the number of different HIPs that were done. Unlike most questions on the NSSE survey, the HIP questions are not limited to the current school year. Thus, seniors' responses include participation from prior years.

<i>High-Impact Practices</i>	<i>First-Year</i>	<i>Senior</i>
Learning Community	✓	✓
Service-Learning	✓	✓
Research with Faculty	✓	✓
Internship or Field Experience		✓
Study Abroad		✓
Culminating Senior Experience		✓
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	✓	✓
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	✓	✓

HIP results are the percentage of students who responded “Done or in progress” except for service-learning which is the percentage who responded that at least “Some” courses included a community-based project.

Analysis

The analysis was done in three stages, with first-year students and seniors examined separately. Results from these three stages of the analysis are presented in the appendix.

First, frequencies were computed for EIIs, Perceived Gains, Satisfaction, additional items, and HIPs. We also computed frequencies for all individual items of the Engagement Indicators, Perceived Gains, and Satisfaction scales. Tables in the appendix are organized such that the individual items in each scale are listed immediately after the overall scale score. These frequencies differentiate between all first-year students and seniors at public and private institutions as well as institutions identified by the four Carnegie/Control categories.

Second, to test for significant differences between private and public institutions, independent *t*-tests were conducted on all EI, Perceived Gains, and satisfaction scales and individual items (except the HIP items). Group statistics include means and standard deviations, mean differences, significance levels, and Cohen's *d* effect size. Because the HIPs are binary measures (1 = done, 0 = not done), Chi-Square tests were conducted for statistical comparisons of HIP participation, with tests of significance and Cohen's *h* effect sizes.

Third, to test for significant differences between institutional Carnegie/Control types, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on all Engagement Indicators, scales, and individual items. Scheffe post-hoc tests were run to identify which institutional types differed from the others. The mean of each group is displayed in the table (Appendices H and I), and group means that were significantly different from the means of the BA/MA Private mean are indicated by asterisks (**p*<.05; ***p*<.01; ****p*<.001).

For both the *t*-test and ANOVA results we computed effect sizes—standardized mean difference scores—showing the relative magnitude (or practical significance) of the group differences.

Interpreting Results

In this summary, “frequently” refers to students that reported either “very often” or “often,” and “substantially” refers to students that reported either “very much” or “quite a bit.” Reported significant differences are all *p*<.01 or greater.

Descriptions of significant differences between students at different institutional types on EIIs, other scales, and on individual variables of interest are accompanied by effect sizes which indicate the practical magnitude of the difference. Both Cohen's *d*

(the standardized mean difference) and Cohen's h (the standardized difference between two proportions) effect sizes can be interpreted the same way. Based on new recommendations from a recent NSSE study (Rocconi & Gonyea, 2015), an effect size of .1 can be considered small, .3 medium, and .5 large.

Results

First, results are presented in summary form below, followed by descriptions of more detailed findings for each measure. Detailed results tables are in the appendix.

Summary of Findings

Private Compared with Public

Generally, students at private institutions had significantly higher mean scores on all measures, although the majority of these differences had effect sizes on the small side. For example, first-year students attending private institutions were more engaged in nine of the ten Engagement Indicators, although three of these were of a trivial effect size (Table 1). First-year students at private institutions also perceived more gains in learning, were more satisfied with the institution in general, and were more academically challenged as indicated by the additional items at the bottom of Table 1. Results were essentially the same for seniors (Table 2). A few results for both first-year students and seniors at private institutions were lower than their counterparts at public institutions, but none of these were greater than trivial in effect size.

Private institution students also participated in more High-Impact Practices than did public institution students, particularly at the senior level (Table 3). While first-year students attending private institutions were more likely to participate in service-learning, a greater percentage of them participated in at least one HIP. Seniors attending private institutions were more likely to participate in all HIPs, and all percentages were nontrivial in magnitude with the exception of involvement in a learning community. Consequently, they were also more likely to participate in two or more HIPs during their college careers.

In sum, students attending private institutions can claim experiences that are more academically challenging, better relationships with faculty, higher quality interactions with others on campus, and consistently greater perception that they have learned and grown throughout their learning experiences with their institutions.

BA/MA Privates Compared with Other Carnegie/Control Groups

In general, first-year and senior students at private BA/MA institutions had significantly higher NSSE scores than students at public institutional types, and, though fewer in number, also saw many positive comparisons against students at the doctoral level private institutions. First-year students attending BA/MA private institutions fared the strongest against all three institutional types on student-faculty interactions, effective teaching practices, and quality of interactions (Table 1). On the other measures these same students also had positive effects compared with the public institution students, but were generally on par (no significant differences) with those attending doctoral level privates. However, there is one exception; the BA/MA private first-year students appeared to spend *less time preparing for class* than did their counterparts at the private doctoral institutions (on average 15 hours versus 16 hours at doctoral level privates).

Results for seniors were similar, but not as consistent. Compared to all other types of institutions, seniors attending the BA/MA private institutions had more interaction with faculty, experienced more effective teaching, and also had better quality interactions with people at the institution. In comparison with students attending the private doctoral institutions, BA/MA private institution seniors also engaged in more quantitative reasoning in their coursework and perceived their courses to be more challenging in general. However, BA/MA private institution seniors were less likely to engage in collaborative learning activities. Finally, the largest effect size of all comparisons showed that students attending BA/MA private institutions reported greater development of values and ethics in college (72% of BA/MA private institution seniors reported "substantial" gains versus 62% of seniors at private doctoral institutions).

In terms of High-Impact Practices, students attending private BA/MA institutions compared favorably with the other public institution types and saw mixed results against the doctoral privates. For example, service-learning for first-year students and culminating senior experiences for seniors were more common at BA/MA private institutions than any other type of institution. When compared only with the doctoral level private institutions, the BA/MA private students were more likely to engage in at least one HIP as a first-year student, but were less likely to do so by the time they were seniors. First-year BA/MA private students were less likely to have participated in a learning community when compared with their doctoral private counterparts. In

addition, seniors at doctoral level private institutions reported higher levels of participation in learning communities, research with faculty, internship or field experiences, and study abroad than seniors at BA/MA private institutions.

It is notable among seniors that study abroad participation was particularly strong for BA/MA privates compared with the BA/MA public students, and culminating senior experiences were particularly more common for BA/MA private seniors (58% done), than those at doctoral public institutions (less than 50%).

Table 1. Effect Size Comparison Summary for Engagement Indicators, Perceived Gains, Satisfaction, and Individual Items—First-Year Students

	Private compared to Public	BA/MA Private compared to		
		BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public
Engagement Indicators				
Higher-Order Learning	++	++		++
Reflective & Integrative Learning	++	++		++
Learning Strategies	-			-
Quantitative Reasoning	+	+		+
Collaborative Learning	+	++		+
Discussions with Diverse Others	+	+		-
Student-Faculty Interaction	++	++	++	++
Effective Teaching Practices	++	++	++	++
Quality of Interactions	++	++	++	++
Supportive Environment	++	++	+	+
How Students Assess Their Experience				
Perceived Gains	++	+	+	++
Satisfaction	++	++		+
Additional Items				
Time spent preparing for class	++	++	--	+
Time spent on reading	++	++		++
Average pages of assigned writing	++	++	-	++
Perceived challenge of courses	+	+		+
Institutional emphasis on academic work	+	+		+
Quality of interactions with students	++	++	+	++
Perceived gains—values and ethics	++	++	+	++

+ = $p < .001$, $d < .1$ (trivial); ++ = $p < .001$, $d > .1$ (small); +++ = $p < .001$, $d > .3$ (medium); - = $p < .001$, $d > -.1$ (trivial); -- = $p < .001$, $d < -.1$ (small); blank cells indicate no significant difference.

Table 2. Effect Size Comparison Summary for Engagement Indicators, Perceived Gains, Satisfaction, and Individual Items—Seniors

	Private compared to Public	BA/MA Private compared to		
		BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public
Engagement Indicators				
Higher-Order Learning	++	+	+	++
Reflective & Integrative Learning	++	++	+	++
Learning Strategies	-		-	-
Quantitative Reasoning	+		++	+
Collaborative Learning	-	-	--	-
Discussions with Diverse Others	-	-		-
Student-Faculty Interaction	++	++	++	++
Effective Teaching Practices	++	++	++	++
Quality of Interactions	++	++	++	++
Supportive Environment	++	++	+	++
How Students Assess Their Experience				
Perceived Gains	++	++	+	++
Satisfaction	++	++		++
Additional Items				
Time spent preparing for class	+	++		+
Time spent on reading	++	++	+	++
Average pages of assigned writing	++	++	+	++
Perceived challenge of courses	+	+	++	++
Institutional emphasis on academic work	+	+		+
Quality of interactions with students	+	+	+	++
Perceived gains—values and ethics	++	++	+	+++

+ = $p < .001$, $d < .1$ (trivial); ++ = $p < .001$, $d > .1$ (small); +++ = $p < .001$, $d > .3$ (medium); - = $p < .001$, $d > -.1$ (trivial); -- = $p < .001$, $d < -.1$ (small); blank cells indicate no significant difference.

Table 3. Effect Size Comparison Summary for High-Impact Practices

	Private compared to Public	BA/MA Private compared to		
		BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public
First-Year Students				
Learning Community	-	-	--	--
Service-Learning	++	++	++	++
Research with Faculty		+	+	-
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	++	++	++	++
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	-	+	-	-
Seniors				
Learning Community	+	+	-	+
Service-Learning	++	+	+	++
Research with Faculty	++	++	-	+
Internship or Field Experience	++	++	-	++
Study Abroad	++	+++	-	++
Culminating Senior Experience	++	++	++	+++
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	++	+	--	++
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	++	++	-	++

Results for Engagement Indicators and Component Items

Specific results for each Engagement Indicator, scale, and individual items can be found in the appendix. Separate results tables in the appendix include individual item frequencies by control (public and private) and by the four established Carnegie/control groups. Appendix tables also include statistical comparisons for all EIs, scales, and component items, including t-test results by control and ANOVA results by the four Carnegie/control groups (Appendices D, E, H, & I). Statistical tables not only report the level of statistical significance, but also the effect sizes. Results for High-Impact Practices (Appendix J) include both the frequency of participation in each HIP and the statistical tests and effect sizes.

Higher-Order Learning

Students attending private institutions experienced coursework that emphasized more higher-order learning activities, as indicated by small positive effect sizes for the EI comparison and for three of the four component items. Coursework at private institutions was somewhat more likely to emphasize analyzing ideas or experiences, evaluating points of view and information sources and forming new ideas from various pieces of information.

When compared with other institutional types, students attending the smaller (BA/MA) private institutions also fared well on these measures. Seniors attending the smaller private institutions, in particular, were more challenged in courses to evaluate points of view, etc., and form new ideas—even when compared with students attending the larger (doctoral) private institutions. In fact, when compared with doctoral private seniors, 6% more BA/MA private seniors responded that their coursework substantially (quite a bit or very much) emphasized “evaluating...”.

Reflective & Integrative Learning

In general, both first-year and senior students attending private institutions were engaged in more reflective and integrative learning through their coursework. In particular, though effect sizes were small, private institution students were more likely to connect learning to societal problems, include diverse perspectives in courses, and examine their own strengths and weaknesses on topics. As a specific example, compared with public institution students, 7% more first-year students and 9% more seniors attending private institutions frequently (often or very often) included diverse political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc. perspectives in course discussions or assignments.

Expanding the analysis to the Carnegie/control groups, while positive results continue against the public institution types, seniors attending the BA/MA privates also were more likely than seniors at the doctoral publics to include diverse perspectives (6% more frequently; ES=.14) and to examine the strengths and weakness of their own views (5% more frequently; ES=.11).

Quantitative Reasoning

In measures of quantitative reasoning no meaningful results stand out, positive or negative, based on institutional control or on the more specific Carnegie/control groups.

Learning Strategies

Although the overall Engagement Indicator score for Learning Strategies showed effects in the trivial range, one item looks favorable for students attending private institutions. Both first-year students (ES=.14) and seniors (ES=.11) at private institutions were more likely than their public school peers to identify key information from reading assignments.

Interestingly, additional information was revealed when expanding the analysis to the four Carnegie/control groups, especially comparing the BA/MA and doctoral private institutions seniors. The smaller private institution seniors were more likely than the doctoral private institution seniors to review their notes after class (7% more frequently; ES=.14) and to summarize what they learned in class or from course materials (7% more frequently; ES=.14).

Collaborative Learning

No real differences were observed between public and private institution students in their engagement in collaborative learning; All effect sizes for the EI and individual items were trivial in magnitude.

Seniors attending the BA/MA private institutions, however, were somewhat *less* likely than their doctoral private institution peers to participate in collaborative learning. For example, the BA/MA private seniors were less likely than the doctoral private seniors to ask another student for help understanding course material (4% less frequently; ES= -.11) and to work with other students on course projects (4% less frequently; ES= -.12).

Discussions with Diverse Others

While the overall EI score for this diverse interactions measure shows no meaningful differences between public and private institution students, results for one item stood out for seniors. Fewer private institution seniors frequently had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than their own (7% less frequently; ES = -.15).

Expanding this analysis to the Carnegie/control groups showed the same result for BA/MA private institution seniors compared with the two public institution groups. However, first-year students at BA/MA private institutions were somewhat *more* likely to have discussions with people from a different economic background other than their own (4% more frequently; ES=.12).

Student-Faculty Interaction

Student-faculty interaction continues to be an area of distinctiveness for private institutions. First-year and senior students at private institutions were more likely to interact with faculty about career plans, about co- and extra-curricular activities, about course topics outside of class, and about their academic performance. For example, at public institutions 8% more first-year students and 4% more seniors at public institutions said they *never* discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class. At the same time, about 5% of both first-year students and seniors at private institutions *frequently* did so.

More interesting findings were revealed among the four Carnegie/control groups. While the positive patterns were replicated for students enrolled at the BA/MA private institutions compared with the public institution types, meaningful, positive effects were also found relative to students enrolled at the doctoral private institutions. For example, compared with their peers at doctoral private institutions, first-year students at the BA/MA private institutions were more likely to talk about career plans (6% more frequently; ES=.17), work on activities other than coursework (4% more frequently; ES=.14), discuss course topics (5% more frequently; ES=.13), and discuss academic performance (7% more frequently; ES=.17) with faculty members. Seniors at BA/MA private institutions were also more likely than their counterparts at the doctoral private institutions to talk about career plans (6% more frequently; ES=.11) and discuss their academic performance (7% more frequently; ES=.16) with faculty members.

Effective Teaching Practices

Effective Teaching Practices is a new set of items on the updated NSSE, and private institutions appear to have the edge. For example, students enrolled at private institutions were more likely to have instructors who taught in an organized way, provided feedback on a draft or work in progress, and provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments. On the

latter measure, 7% of first-year students (ES=.17) and 6% of seniors (ES=.14) reported that their institutions substantially provided prompt and detailed feedback.

Further analysis on the four Carnegie/control groups showed that in addition to the positive comparisons with the public institution types, the BA/MA private institutions also compared favorably with the doctoral private institutions on Effective Teaching Practices. For example, compared with their peers at doctoral private institutions, both first-year students and seniors at BA/MA private institutions experienced instructors who provided more feedback on a draft or work in progress (FY: 6% more substantial, ES=.14; Senior: 9% more substantial, ES=.22) and more extensive prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments (FY: 7% more substantial, ES=.16; Senior: 7% more substantial, ES=.18).

Quality of Interactions

Some of the most positive effects for private institutions overall were with the Quality of Interactions EI and items. Compared to their public institution counterparts, students enrolled at private institutions rated their interactions with other students, advisors, and faculty more favorably. Consistent with the Student-Faculty Interaction and Effective Teaching Practices above, the quality of interactions with academic advisors (FY: ES=.10; Senior: ES=.18) and with faculty (FY: ES=.23; Senior: ES=.20) was very positive for private institutions students. In fact, compared with the public institution students, on a 7-point scale from poor to excellent, fully 11% of first-year students and 8% of seniors at private institutions rated their interactions with faculty at least a 6. Interactions with student services and administrative staff, however, were not meaningfully different between public and private institutions.

Turning to the Carnegie/control comparisons, more interesting results between the smaller and larger private institutions were found—particularly among seniors. For example, compared with their private doctoral institution counterparts, seniors enrolled at private BA/MA institutions rated their interactions with academic advisors (14% more rated at least a 6; ES=.27), faculty (7% more rated at least a 6; ES=.27), student services staff (4% more rated at least a 6; ES=.27), and administrative staff (10% more rated at least a 6; ES=.27) more favorably. (The size of the effect for academic advisors is noteworthy, as is the affirming, positive results for student services and administrative staff.)

Supportive Environment

Rounding out the Engagement Indicators, student perceptions of the campus environment—curricular and cocurricular—were also generally more favorable for private institutions. For example, students enrolled at private institutions were more likely to experience institutions that emphasized support to help them succeed academically (FY: ES=.12; Senior: ES=.18) and attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues (FY: ES=.15; Senior: ES=.14).

How Students Assess Their Experiences

Perceived Gains

Private institution students generally had better regard for the progress they had made in learning and development, particularly among seniors who had a longer exposure to the private institution experience. For example, private institution seniors perceived more gains in writing clearly and effectively (7% more reported “Very much,” ES=.19), speaking clearly and effectively (6% more reported “Very much,” ES=.16), thinking critically and analytically (7% more reported “Very much,” ES=.15), and being an informed and active citizen (6% more reported “Quite a bit” or “Very much,” ES=.13). Both first-year students (8% more reported “Quite a bit” or “Very much,” ES=.20) and seniors (11% more reported “Quite a bit” or “Very much,” ES=.27) attending private institutions were more likely to say they made greater strides in developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics. The one area where private institutions lagged behind was in perceiving gains in analyzing numerical and statistical information. On that measure first-year private institution students were effectively below (5% fewer reported “Quite a bit” or “Very much,” ES= -.11) the typical public institution student.

Examining this construct by the four Carnegie/control groups shows similar results between the BA/MA privates and the public institution types, and though comparatively higher than the doctoral privates, only a few effect sizes were anything but trivial. Compared with students attending the doctoral private institutions, those attending the BA/MA institutions perceived more gains in writing and speaking for seniors, though the effect sizes were small and bordering on trivial. None of the other measures stood out as distinctive for BA/MA privates versus the larger private institutions. Interestingly, the negative result on perceived gains in analyzing numerical and statistical information was most pronounced between the BA/MA privates and the doctoral public institutions.

Satisfaction

In general, students attending private institutions are somewhat more satisfied than students attending public institutions. However, looking at the two questions about satisfaction, it's clear that only one of them draws out the difference. Both first-year and senior students attending private institutions were more likely to rate their entire educational experience higher than their public institution counterparts. For example, when compared with their peers at public institutions, 9% more first-year students and 12% more seniors attending private institutions rated their overall educational experience as "Excellent." However, when asked if given a chance to start over if they would attend the same institution, differences were only trivial.

Looking at the four Carnegie/control groups, students attending the BA/MA private institutions were more satisfied than their counterparts at the two public institution types—particularly on their ratings of the overall educational experience. However, they were no more satisfied than their peers at doctoral private institutions. For example, looking at only the BA/MA categories, 12% more first-year students and 12% more seniors at the private institutions rated their overall educational experience as "Excellent" compared with their public instruction counterparts.

Additional Items

On the set of seven additional items included in the analysis, private institutions scored higher across the board, although at times the effects were trivial. For example, first-year students at private institutions spent more hours reading, writing, and studying than did their public school peers. Forty-six percent of first-year students attending private institutions studied at least 16 hours a week, compared to 39% for their public institution counterparts. Similarly, when asked how many of their studying hours were on assigned reading, 10% more first-year students at private institutions responded "Most" or "Almost all." Finally, 13% first-year students at private institutions wrote at least 6 small papers, 9% more wrote at least 3 papers of between 6 and 10 pages, and 7% more wrote at least one paper of 11 pages or more. The effects for seniors were similar, but somewhat smaller.

Of the remaining additional items, positive effects for private institution students were found for the quality of interactions with students and for perceived gains in developing or clarifying a personal code of values or ethics. The latter had stronger effects than most; both first-year students (8% more reported "Quite a bit" or "Very much," $ES=.20$) and seniors (11% more reported "Quite a bit" or "Very much," $ES=.27$) attending private institutions were more likely to say they made greater strides in developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics.

Examining the additional items by the four Carnegie/control categories, the same effects are observed between the BA/MA private institutions and the two public institution types. However, very few real differences were observed between the two types of private institutions. In one important exception, first-year students attending BA/MA private institutions lagged a bit behind their doctoral private counterparts in the time spent in academic preparation. The effect size was $-.11$, amounting to about 4% fewer BA/MA private students studying 16 or more hours a week. On the other hand, another small but notably positive difference was observed for seniors at the BA/MA private institution compared with their doctoral private peers. The seniors at BA/MA private institutions were somewhat more likely to say that their courses challenged them to do their best work; for example, 5% more seniors responded "Very Much" ($ES=.11$).

High-Impact Practices

As reported in the summary above, private institution students participated in more High-Impact Practices (HIP) than did public school students, particularly at the senior level (see Table 3 and Appendix J). For example, 7% more first-year students attending private institutions participated in **service-learning**, compared to those at public institutions ($ES=.15$). Because of this, a greater percentage (5% more) of first-year students participated in at least one HIP. Seniors attending private institutions were more likely to participate in all six High-Impact Practices, and all percentages were nontrivial in magnitude with the exception of involvement in a **learning community**. For example, at private institutions 8% more seniors participated in **service-learning**, 5% more **worked on a research project with a faculty member**, 8% more had an **internship or field experience**, 11% more **studied abroad**, and 12% more were asked to do a **culminating senior experience**. Consequently, 9% more seniors at private institutions participated in at least two HIPs during their college careers.

For the most part, students attending private BA/MA institutions compared favorably with the two public institution types on the HIP measures, while results were mixed in comparison with the doctoral privates. The first HIP listed—**participation in a learning community**—had the least positive results for the BA/MA privates. First-year students at BA/MA private institutions were *less* likely to participate in a learning community, particularly in comparison with the doctoral-level public and private institutions. For example, 4% more first-year students at doctoral private institutions ($ES= -.11$) and 6% more at doctoral public institutions ($ES= -.18$) reported having been part of a learning community. These effects were essentially non-existent for seniors. On the other hand, three in five (59%) first-year students at BA/MA private institutions participated in **service-learning**—more than the other three institutional types. Seniors were also more likely to have done **service-learning** at BA/MA

private institutions, though the differences were smaller. Results for **working on a research project with a faculty member** are consistent with the public/private distinction reported above, and BA/MA private institutions were essentially on par with their doctoral-level counterparts. When compared with seniors at doctoral private institutions, about 5% fewer seniors at BA/MA private institutions had done an **internship or field experience**, although the effect size (-.09) borders on trivial. While students attending private institutions in general were more likely to **study abroad**, seniors at the BA/MA private institutions were less likely than seniors at the doctoral private institutions to go abroad, although the difference was only about 3%. Finally, among all four Carnegie/control groups, seniors at the BA/MA private institution were the most likely to complete a **culminating senior experience**.

Conclusion

Independent colleges and universities make a unique contribution to institutional diversity in American higher education and provide students a distinctive liberal arts education experience (Thelin, Sanoff & Suggs, 2006). College impact studies conducted over the last 50 years demonstrate the value of the independent sector of higher education in the positive promotion of cognitive growth, value development, and degree completion (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). This report draws additional evidence from NSSE to demonstrate that students at private institutions are engaged at consistently higher levels across a range of dimensions of educational effectiveness than students at public institutions. Several areas of distinction in the private institution undergraduate experience include greater exposure to academically challenging experiences, especially with coursework emphasizing higher-order learning and reflection and integrative learning experiences, more effort dedicated to studying, writing and reading, more frequent and high-quality interactions with faculty and exposure to effective teaching practices, elevated rates of high-impact practices, and a more supportive environment for learning, in comparison to public institutions. Only a few dimensions of the undergraduate experience are indistinct between privates and publics at the senior level, showing less emphasis in learning strategies, collaborative learning, and discussions with diverse others.

Results from the more refined comparative analysis between BA/MA private institutions and three groups, BA/MA public, doctoral private, and doctoral public institutions offers a slightly more nuanced impression of differences in the undergraduate experience. Again, the comparison to similar public institutions generally confirms the strengths identified in comparison to all public institutions, particularly in the first year experience. However, comparisons to the doctoral institutions show a little more variation, particularly at doctoral privates. Two of the differences are notable, including the higher proportion of seniors reporting collaborative learning experiences and participation in high-impact practices.

To help strengthen the quality of students' learning experience, BA/MA private institutions might consider the findings that showed no significant difference related to quantitative reasoning experiences and corresponding low student perceived gains in analyzing numerical information, lower levels of collaborative learning for seniors than at doctoral private institutions, and fewer students having discussions with people with religious beliefs other than their own. In addition, the lack of difference in the proportion of seniors who experienced high-impact practices, in particular research with faculty, internships and field experiences, and study abroad, are worth looking into.

Findings from this study affirm the value of independent colleges and universities for undergraduate student learning. Students at private institutions are engaged at reasonably high levels and to a greater degree than their peers in the public sector. However, some of the trivial effect sizes across a range of NSSE measures, particularly in areas that independent sector institutions make strong claims for distinction, suggest the value of investments in enhancing educational practice. Even more, consistent with NSSE's mission to foster improvement in the undergraduate experience by encouraging the use of institution-level results to monitor and improve effective educational practice, CIC member institutions with NSSE data are encouraged to critically examine and act on campus level results. Campuses should consider their results in relation to their own claims of educational distinction, as well as in comparison to the areas of strength and opportunities for improvement illustrated in the sector comparison results, and then develop action strategies to create more vibrant undergraduate experience so more students thrive.

References

- BrckaLorenz, A., Ribera, T. & Gonyea, R.M. (2009). "Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Descriptive Analysis by Institutional Type." Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). *Excerpt from High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Kuh, G. & Gonyea, R.M. (2006). "Independent Colleges and Student Engagement: Do Religious Affiliation and Institutional Type Matter?" Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2004). "Benchmark Scale Analyses Prepared for the Council of Independent Colleges." Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2007). *National Survey of Student Engagement 2008 Invitation to Participate*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2005). *How College Affects Students: Vol. 2. A Third Decade of Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rocconi, L. & Gonyea, R.M. (2015). "Contextualizing Student Engagement Effect Sizes: An Empirical Analysis." Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Thelin, J., Sanoff, A., Suggs, W. (2006). *Meeting the Challenge: America's Independent Colleges and Universities since 1956*. Washington, DC: Council of Independent Colleges.

Appendix

Appendix A: NSSE 2013 and 2014 Participating Institutions by Carnegie/Control Groups

BA/MA Private

Abilene Christian University (TX)	Clarke University (IA)*	Grinnell College (IA)*
Agnes Scott College (GA)*	Coker College (SC)*	Grove City College (PA)*
Alaska Pacific University (AK)*	Colby College (ME)	Guilford College (NC)*
Albion College (MI)*	Colgate University (NY)	Gustavus Adolphus College (MN)*
Albright College (PA)*	College of Our Lady of the Elms (MA)*	Hamilton College (NY)
Alice Lloyd College (KY)*	College of Saint Elizabeth (NJ)*	Hampden-Sydney College (VA)*
Allegheny College (PA)*	College of the Atlantic (ME)	Hanover College (IN)*
Alma College (MI)*	College of the Holy Cross (MA)	Harrisburg University of Science and Technology (PA)
Alvernia University (PA)*	College of the Ozarks (MO)	Hartwick College (NY)*
Alverno College (WI)*	Colorado College (CO)*	Harvey Mudd College (CA)
Anderson University (SC)*	Columbia College (SC)*	Hastings College (NE)*
Anna Maria College (MA)*	Columbia College Chicago (IL)*	Hawaii Pacific University (HI)
Aquinas College (MI)*	Concordia College at Moorhead (MN)*	Hendrix College (AR)*
Arcadia University (PA)*	Concordia College-New York (NY)*	Heritage University (WA)*
Assumption College (MA)*	Concordia University (OR)	High Point University (NC)*
Augsburg College (MN)*	Concordia University Chicago (IL)*	Hiram College (OH)*
Augustana College (SD)*	Concordia University Irvine (CA)*	Hollins University (VA)*
Austin College (TX)*	Concordia University Nebraska (NE)	Holy Cross College (IN)*
Ave Maria University (FL)	Concordia University Texas (TX)*	Holy Family University (PA)*
Averett University (VA)*	Concordia University-Saint Paul (MN)*	Hope College (MI)*
Avila University (MO)*	Concordia University-Wisconsin (WI)*	Hope International University (CA)
Baker University (KS)*	Connecticut College (CT)*	Houghton College (NY)*
Baldwin Wallace University (OH)*	Converse College (SC)*	Houston Baptist University (TX)
Barton College (NC)*	Cornerstone University (MI)*	Humphreys College (CA)
Belmont Abbey College (NC)*	Covenant College (GA)*	Huntington University (IN)*
Belmont University (TN)	Culver-Stockton College (MO)*	Huston-Tillotson University (TX)*
Beloit College (WI)	Cumberland University (TN)	Illinois College (IL)*
Benedictine College (KS)*	Dakota Wesleyan University (SD)*	Illinois Wesleyan University (IL)*
Berea College (KY)*	Davis & Elkins College (WV)*	Indiana Wesleyan University (IN)*
Berry College (GA)*	Defiance College (OH)*	Iona College (NY)
Bethany College (WV)*	Delaware Valley College (PA)*	Iowa Wesleyan College (IA)*
Bethany Lutheran College (MN)*	Denison University (OH)*	Ithaca College (NY)*
Bethel University (MN)*	DeSales University (PA)*	Jacksonville University (FL)*
Bethune Cookman University (FL)*	Dillard University (LA)*	John Brown University (AR)*
Birmingham-Southern College (AL)*	Doane College (NE)*	John Carroll University (OH)*
Blackburn College (IL)*	Dominican College of Blauvelt (NY)*	Johnson & Wales University (RI)
Bloomfield College (NJ)*	Dominican University (IL)*	Judson College (AL)
Bluefield College (VA)*	Dominican University of California (CA)*	Judson University (IL)*
Brenau University (GA)*	Dordt College (IA)*	Juniata College (PA)*
Brescia University (KY)*	Dowling College (NY)*	Kalamazoo College (MI)*
Brevard College (NC)*	Drake University (IA)*	Kansas Wesleyan University (KS)*
Briar Cliff University (IA)*	Drew University (NJ)*	Kentucky Wesleyan College (KY)*
Brigham Young University-Hawaii (HI)	East Texas Baptist University (TX)*	Kenyon College (OH)*
Brigham Young University-Idaho (ID)	Eastern Mennonite University (VA)*	Kettering University (MI)
Bryant University (RI)	Eastern Nazarene College (MA)	Keuka College (NY)*
Bryn Athyn College of the New Church (PA)*	Eastern University (PA)*	Keystone College (PA)*
Bryn Mawr College (PA)	Elizabethtown College (PA)*	Knox College (IL)*
Bucknell University (PA)*	Elmhurst College (IL)*	La Roche College (PA)*
Buena Vista University (IA)*	Elon University (NC)	La Salle University (PA)
Butler University (IN)*	Emerson College (MA)*	La Sierra University (CA)
Cabrini College (PA)*	Emory and Henry College (VA)*	LaGrange College (GA)*
California Baptist University (CA)*	Eureka College (IL)*	Lake Forest College (IL)
California Lutheran University (CA)*	Fairfield University (CT)	Lawrence Technological University (MI)
Campbell University Inc. (NC)	Faulkner University (AL)	Lawrence University (WI)
Campbellsville University (KY)*	Felician College (NJ)*	Lebanon Valley College (PA)*
Capital University (OH)*	Fisk University (TN)*	Lees-McRae College (NC)
Carlow University (PA)*	Flagler College (FL)*	Lenoir-Rhyne University (NC)*
Carroll University (WI)*	Florida Southern College (FL)	Lewis & Clark College (OR)*
Carson-Newman University (TN)*	Fontbonne University (MO)*	Lewis University (IL)*
Carthage College (WI)*	Franklin College (IN)*	Liberty University (VA)
Catawba College (NC)*	Franklin Pierce University (NH)*	Life University (GA)
Cedar Crest College (PA)*	Fresno Pacific University (CA)*	Limestone College (SC)*
Cedarville University (OH)*	Friends University (KS)*	Lincoln Memorial University (TN)*
Centenary College of Louisiana (LA)*	Furman University (SC)*	Lindenwood University (MO)*
Central College (IA)*	Gallaudet University (DC)	Lindsey Wilson College (KY)*
Central Methodist University (MO)*	Gannon University (PA)*	Linfield College - McMinnville Campus (OR)*
Centre College (KY)*	Gardner-Webb University (NC)*	Linfield College-Adult Degree Program (OR)
Chaminade University of Honolulu (HI)*	George Fox University (OR)*	Lipscomb University (TN)
Chapman University (CA)*	Georgian Court University (NJ)*	Loras College (IA)*
Chatham University (PA)*	Gettysburg College (PA)*	Loyola Marymount University (CA)
Chestnut Hill College (PA)*	Golden Gate University-San Francisco (CA)*	Loyola University New Orleans (LA)*
Chowan University (NC)*	Gonzaga University (WA)*	Lubbock Christian University (TX)
Christian Brothers University (TN)*	Gordon College (MA)*	Luther College (IA)*
Claflin University (SC)*	Goshen College (IN)*	Lycoming College (PA)*
Clairemont McKenna College (CA)	Goucher College (MD)*	Lynchburg College (VA)*
	Green Mountain College (VT)	Lyon College (AR)*
	Greensboro College (NC)*	Macalester College (MN)

MacMurray College (IL)*	Paul Smith's College (NY)*	Tennessee Wesleyan College (TN)*
Madonna University (MI)*	Pfeiffer University (NC)*	Texas College (TX)*
Maharishi University of Management (IA)	Philander Smith College (AR)*	The College of Idaho (ID)*
Malone University (OH)*	Pitzer College (CA)	The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University (MN)*
Manchester University (IN)*	Point Loma Nazarene University (CA)*	The College of Saint Rose (NY)*
Manhattan College (NY)	Point Park University (PA)*	The College of Saint Scholastica (MN)*
Manhattanville College (NY)*	Presbyterian College (SC)*	The Sage Colleges (NY)*
Maranatha Baptist Bible College (WI)	Prescott College (AZ)*	The University of Findlay (OH)*
Marian University (WI)*	Providence College (RI)	The University of Tampa (FL)
Marietta College (OH)*	Queens University of Charlotte (NC)*	Thiel College (PA)*
Marist College (NY)	Quincy University (IL)*	Thomas More College (KY)*
Marlboro College (VT)*	Randolph College (VA)*	Tiffin University (OH)*
Mars Hill University (NC)*	Randolph-Macon College (VA)*	Touro College (NY)
Martin Methodist College (TN)*	Regis University (CO)*	Trine University (IN)*
Mary Baldwin College (VA)*	Rhodes College (TN)*	Trinity Christian College (IL)*
Marygrove College (MI)*	Rider University (NJ)*	Trinity University (TX)
Marymount Manhattan College (NY)*	Ripon College (WI)*	Tusculum College (TN)*
Marymount University (VA)	Rivier University (NH)*	Union College (KY)*
Marywood University (PA)*	Roanoke College (VA)*	Union College (NE)*
McKendree University (IL)*	Robert Morris University (PA)*	Union University (TN)
McMurry University (TX)*	Rochester Institute of Technology (NY)	University of Bridgeport (CT)*
McPherson College (KS)*	Rockford University (IL)*	University of Charleston (WV)*
Medaille College (NY)*	Rocky Mountain College (MT)*	University of Dallas (TX)*
Menlo College (CA)	Roger Williams University (RI)*	University of Detroit Mercy (MI)
Mercer University (GA)	Rollins College (FL)*	University of Evansville (IN)*
Mercy College (NY)*	Rosemont College (PA)*	University of Great Falls (MT)*
Mercyhurst University (PA)*	Sacred Heart University (CT)*	University of Indianapolis (IN)*
Meredith College (NC)*	Saint Andrews University (NC)*	University of Mobile (AL)
Merrimack College (MA)*	Saint Anselm College (NH)*	University of Mount Union (OH)*
Messiah College (PA)*	Saint Joseph's College (IN)*	University of New England (ME)*
Methodist University (NC)*	Saint Joseph's College of Maine (ME)*	University of Pikeville (KY)*
MidAmerica Nazarene University (KS)*	Saint Leo University (FL)*	University of Puget Sound (WA)*
Midland University (NE)*	Saint Mary's College (IN)*	University of Richmond (VA)*
Midway College (KY)*	Saint Mary's College of California (CA)	University of Sacred Heart (PR)
Milligan College (TN)*	Saint Michael's College (VT)*	University of Saint Joseph (CT)*
Millikin University (IL)*	Saint Thomas University (FL)*	University of Saint Mary (KS)*
Mills College (CA)*	Saint Vincent College (PA)*	University of St. Francis (IL)*
Millsaps College (MS)*	Saint Xavier University (IL)*	University of St. Thomas (TX)*
Misericordia University (PA)*	Salve Regina University (RI)*	University of the Cumberlands (KY)*
Missouri Valley College (MO)*	Samford University (AL)*	University of the Incarnate Word (TX)*
Mitchell College (CT)*	Schreiner University (TX)*	University of the Ozarks (AR)*
Molloy College (NY)*	Scripps College (CA)*	Upper Iowa University (IA)*
Monmouth College (IL)*	Seattle University (WA)	Ursuline College (OH)*
Morningside College (IA)*	Seton Hill University (PA)*	Valparaiso University (IN)*
Mount Olive College (NC)*	Sewanee: The University of the South (TN)*	Vanguard University of Southern California (CA)
Mount Saint Mary College (NY)*	Shaw University (NC)*	Vassar College (NY)
Mount St. Mary's University (MD)*	Shenandoah University (VA)*	Virginia Wesleyan College (VA)*
Muhlenberg College (PA)*	Siena Heights University (MI)*	Viterbo University (WI)*
Naropa University (CO)*	Sierra Nevada College (NV)*	Wabash College (IN)*
Nazareth College (NY)	Simmons College (MA)*	Walla Walla University (WA)
Nebraska Wesleyan University (NE)*	Simpson College (IA)*	Walsh University (OH)*
Neumann University (PA)*	Simpson University (CA)*	Warner University (FL)*
New England College (NH)*	Skidmore College (NY)	Warren Wilson College (NC)*
New York Institute of Technology (NY)	Southeastern University (FL)*	Wartburg College (IA)*
Newbury College-Brookline (MA)	Southern Adventist University (TN)*	Washington Adventist University (MD)*
Newman University (KS)*	Southern Nazarene University (OK)	Washington and Lee University (VA)*
Niagara University (NY)	Southern Vermont College (VT)*	Wayland Baptist University (TX)*
Nichols College (MA)*	Southwest Baptist University (MO)	Waynesburg University (PA)*
North Central College (IL)*	Southwestern Adventist University (TX)*	Wentworth Institute of Technology (MA)
North Park University (IL)*	Southwestern Assemblies of God University (TX)	Wesleyan College (GA)*
Northwest Nazarene University (ID)*	Southwestern Christian University (OK)	West Virginia Wesleyan College (WV)*
Northwest University (WA)	Southwestern College (KS)*	Westminster College (MO)*
Northwestern College (IA)*	Southwestern University (TX)*	Westminster College (UT)*
Norwich University (VT)*	Spelman College (GA)*	Westmont College (CA)*
Notre Dame de Namur University (CA)*	Spring Hill College (AL)*	Wheaton College (IL)*
Notre Dame of Maryland University (MD)*	Springfield College (MA)*	Wheaton College (MA)*
Nyack College (NY)*	St. Bonaventure University (NY)*	Wheeling Jesuit University (WV)*
Oglethorpe University (GA)*	St. Catherine University (MN)*	Wheelock College (MA)*
Ohio Dominican University (OH)*	St. Edward's University (TX)*	Whitman College (WA)*
Ohio Northern University (OH)*	St. Francis College (NY)	Whitworth University (WA)*
Ohio Valley University (WV)*	St. Gregory's University (OK)	Wilberforce University (OH)*
Ohio Wesleyan University (OH)*	St. Lawrence University (NY)*	Wiley College (TX)*
Oklahoma Baptist University (OK)	St. Mary's University (TX)*	William Jewell College (MO)*
Oklahoma Christian University (OK)	St. Olaf College (MN)*	William Peace University (NC)*
Oklahoma City University (OK)*	Stephens College (MO)*	William Woods University (MO)*
Oral Roberts University (OK)*	Sterling College (VT)	Wilson College (PA)*
Ottawa University (KS)*	Stetson University (FL)*	Wingate University (NC)*
Otterbein University (OH)*	Stevenson University (MD)*	Wisconsin Lutheran College (WI)*
Pacific Lutheran University (WA)*	Stonehill College (MA)*	Wittenberg University (OH)*
Pacific Union College (CA)*	Suffolk University (MA)*	Wofford College (SC)*
Pacific University (OR)*	Susquehanna University (PA)*	Woodbury University (CA)*
Paine College (GA)	Sweet Briar College (VA)*	Xavier University (OH)
Palm Beach Atlantic University-West Palm Beach (FL)*	Tabor College (KS)*	York College of Pennsylvania (PA)*
Park University (MO)*	Taylor University (IN)*	

BA/MA Public

Adams State University (CO)
 Alabama State University (AL)
 Albany State University (GA)
 Angelo State University (TX)
 Armstrong State University (GA)
 Auburn University at Montgomery (AL)
 Austin Peay State University (TN)
 Bemidji State University (MN)
 Black Hills State University (SD)
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Bridgewater State University (MA)
 California Maritime Academy (CA)
 California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo (CA)
 California State Polytechnic University-Pomona (CA)
 California State University San Marcos (CA)
 California State University, Fullerton (CA)
 California State University, Monterey Bay (CA)
 California State University, Northridge (CA)
 California State University, Sacramento (CA)
 California State University, San Bernardino (CA)
 California State University-Bakersfield (CA)
 California State University-Channel Islands (CA)
 California State University-Chico (CA)
 California State University-Los Angeles (CA)
 California State University-Stanislaus (CA)
 California University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Cameron University (OK)
 Central Connecticut State University (CT)
 Central Washington University (WA)
 Chadron State College (NE)
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Christopher Newport University (VA)
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Clayton State University (GA)
 Coastal Carolina University (SC)
 College of Charleston (SC)
 Colorado Mesa University (CO)
 Colorado State University-Pueblo (CO)
 Columbus State University (GA)
 Concord University (WV)
 Coppin State University (MD)
 CUNY Bernard M Baruch College (NY)
 CUNY Herbert H. Lehman College (NY)
 CUNY Hunter College (NY)
 CUNY Queens College (NY)
 Dakota State University (SD)
 Delaware State University (DE)
 Dickinson State University (ND)
 East Central University (OK)
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Eastern Connecticut State University (CT)
 Eastern Illinois University (IL)
 Eastern Kentucky University (KY)
 Eastern Michigan University (MI)
 Eastern Oregon University (OR)
 Eastern Washington University (WA)
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Elizabeth City State University (NC)
 Emporia State University (KS)
 Farmingdale State College (NY)
 Fashion Institute of Technology (NY)
 Fayetteville State University (NC)
 Ferris State University (MI)
 Florida Gulf Coast University (FL)
 Fort Hays State University (KS)
 Fort Lewis College (CO)
 Fort Valley State University (GA)
 Framingham State University (MA)
 Francis Marion University (SC)
 Fredonia State University of New York (NY)
 Georgia College & State University (GA)
 Georgia Gwinnett College (GA)
 Georgia Southwestern State University (GA)
 Grambling State University (LA)
 Grand Valley State University (MI)
 Henderson State University (AR)
 Humboldt State University (CA)
 Indiana University East (IN)
 Jacksonville State University (AL)
 James Madison University (VA)
 Kean University (NJ)

Keene State College (NH)
 Kennesaw State University (GA)
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Lake Superior State University (MI)
 Lander University (SC)
 Lewis-Clark State College (ID)
 Lock Haven University (PA)
 Longwood University (VA)
 Lyndon State College (VT)
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Marshall University (WV)
 Mayville State University (ND)
 McNeese State University (LA)
 Metropolitan State University (MN)
 Metropolitan State University of Denver (CO)
 Midwestern State University (TX)
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Minnesota State University Moorhead (MN)
 Minnesota State University-Mankato (MN)
 Minot State University (ND)
 Mississippi University for Women (MS)
 Missouri Southern State University (MO)
 Missouri Western State University (MO)
 Montana State University Billings (MT)
 Morehead State University (KY)
 Murray State University (KY)
 Nevada State College at Henderson (NV)
 New College of Florida (FL)
 New Jersey City University (NJ)
 New Mexico Highlands University (NM)
 New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology (NM)
 Nicholls State University (LA)
 Norfolk State University (VA)
 North Carolina Central University (NC)
 Northeastern Illinois University (IL)
 Northeastern State University (OK)
 Northern Michigan University (MI)
 Northern State University (SD)
 Northwestern Oklahoma State University (OK)
 Northwestern State University of Louisiana (LA)
 Ohio State University-Lima Campus (OH)
 Peru State College (NE)
 Pittsburg State University (KS)
 Plymouth State University (NH)
 Prairie View A&M University (TX)
 Purdue University-Calumet Campus (IN)
 Ramapo College of New Jersey (NJ)
 Rhode Island College (RI)
 Rowan University (NJ)
 Salem State University (MA)
 San Francisco State University (CA)
 San Jose State University (CA)
 Savannah State University (GA)
 Shawnee State University (OH)
 Shepherd University (WV)
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Sonoma State University (CA)
 Southeastern Louisiana University (LA)
 Southern Connecticut State University (CT)
 Southern Illinois Univ Edwardsville (IL)
 Southern Oregon University (OR)
 Southern Polytechnic State University (GA)
 Southern Utah University (UT)
 Southwest Minnesota State University (MN)
 Southwestern Oklahoma State University (OK)
 St. Cloud State University (MN)
 St. Mary's College of Maryland (MD)
 State University of New York at New Paltz (NY)
 Stephen F. Austin State University (TX)
 SUNY at Purchase College (NY)
 SUNY College at Cortland (NY)
 SUNY College at Old Westbury (NY)
 SUNY College at Oneonta (NY)
 SUNY College at Oswego (NY)
 SUNY College at Plattsburgh (NY)
 SUNY Empire State College (NY)
 SUNY Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome (NY)
 SUNY Maritime College (NY)
 Tarleton State University (TX)
 Tennessee Technological University (TN)
 Texas A&M International University (TX)
 Texas A&M University - Texarkana (TX)
 Texas State University (TX)
 The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina (SC)
 The College at Brockport, SUNY (NY)
 The Evergreen State College (WA)
 The Lincoln University (PA)
 The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey (NJ)
 The State University of New York at Geneseo (NY)
 The State University of New York at Potsdam (NY)
 The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (TN)
 The University of Tennessee Martin (TN)
 The University of Texas at Brownsville (TX)
 The University of Texas at Tyler (TX)
 The University of Texas of the Permian Basin (TX)
 The University of Texas-Pan American (TX)
 The University of Virginia's College at Wise (VA)
 Towson University (MD)
 Truman State University (MO)
 United States Air Force Academy (CO)
 United States Merchant Marine Academy (NY)
 United States Military Academy (NY)
 United States Naval Academy (MD)
 University of Arkansas at Monticello (AR)
 University of Baltimore (MD)
 University of Central Missouri (MO)
 University of Colorado Colorado Springs (CO)
 University of Hawai'i at Hilo (HI)
 University of Houston-Clear Lake (TX)
 University of Houston-Downtown (TX)
 University of Houston-Victoria (TX)
 University of Illinois Springfield (IL)
 University of Louisiana Monroe (LA)
 University of Maine at Farmington (ME)
 University of Maine at Fort Kent (ME)
 University of Maine at Machias (ME)
 University of Maine at Presque Isle (ME)
 University of Mary Washington (VA)
 University of Maryland-Eastern Shore (MD)
 University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (MA)
 University of Michigan-Dearborn (MI)
 University of Michigan-Flint (MI)
 University of Minnesota Duluth (MN)
 University of Minnesota, Morris (MN)
 University of Minnesota-Crookston (MN)
 University of Montevallo (AL)
 University of Nebraska at Kearney (NE)
 University of North Carolina at Pembroke (NC)
 University of North Carolina Wilmington (NC)
 University of North Florida (FL)
 University of North Georgia (GA)
 University of Northern Iowa (IA)
 University of Pittsburgh-Bradford (PA)
 University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown (PA)
 University of Puerto Rico at Cayey (PR)
 University of Puerto Rico in Ponce (PR)
 University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (OK)
 University of South Carolina Aiken (SC)
 University of South Carolina-Beaufort (SC)
 University of South Florida-St. Petersburg Campus (FL)
 University of Southern Indiana (IN)
 University of Southern Maine (ME)
 University of the Virgin Islands (VI)
 University of West Georgia (GA)
 University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Parkside (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Platteville (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-River Falls (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Stout (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Superior (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (WI)
 Utah Valley University (UT)
 Valdosta State University (GA)
 Valley City State University (ND)
 Virginia Military Institute (VA)
 Washburn University (KS)
 Weber State University (UT)
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 West Texas A&M University (TX)
 West Virginia State University (WV)
 West Virginia University Institute of Technology (WV)
 Western Connecticut State University (CT)
 Western Illinois University (IL)

Western Oregon University (OR)
 Western State Colorado University (CO)
 Western Washington University (WA)
 Westfield State University (MA)
 William Paterson University of New Jersey (NJ)
 Winona State University (MN)
 Winston-Salem State University (NC)
 Winthrop University (SC)
 Worcester State University (MA)
 Youngstown State University (OH)

Doctoral Private

Adelphi University (NY)
 American University (DC)
 Andrews University (MI)*
 Barry University (FL)
 Baylor University (TX)*
 Benedictine University (IL)*
 Biola University (CA)*
 Boston College (MA)
 Boston University (MA)
 Brigham Young University (UT)
 Cardinal Stritch University (WI)*
 Carnegie Mellon University (PA)
 Clark University (MA)
 Clarkson University (NY)
 DePaul University (IL)*
 Florida Institute of Technology (FL)
 Fordham University (NY)
 Hofstra University (NY)
 Howard University (DC)
 Illinois Institute of Technology (IL)
 Immaculata University (PA)*
 Inter American University of Puerto Rico-Metro (PR)
 Loyola University Chicago (IL)
 Marquette University (WI)
 Maryville University of Saint Louis (MO)*
 Northeastern University (MA)
 Nova Southeastern University (FL)
 NYU - Polytechnic School of Engineering (NY)
 Our Lady of the Lake University-San Antonio (TX)*
 Pace University (NY)*
 Pepperdine University (CA)
 Regent University (VA)*
 Saint John Fisher College (NY)*
 Saint Louis University (MO)*
 Saint Mary's University of Minnesota (MN)*
 Seton Hall University (NJ)
 St. John's University-New York (NY)
 Stevens Institute of Technology (NJ)
 Texas Christian University (TX)*
 The Catholic University of America (DC)
 The New School (NY)*
 Trevecca Nazarene University (TN)*
 Tulane University of Louisiana (LA)
 University of Dayton (OH)
 University of Denver (CO)*
 University of La Verne (CA)*
 University of San Francisco (CA)
 University of St. Thomas (MN)*
 University of Tulsa (OK)

Wilmington University (DE)*
 Yeshiva University (NY)

Doctoral Public

Auburn University (AL)
 Binghamton University-State University of New York (NY)
 Bowie State University (MD)
 Bowling Green State University (OH)
 Clemson University (SC)
 College of William & Mary (VA)
 Colorado School of Mines (CO)
 East Tennessee State University (TN)
 Florida A&M University (FL)
 Florida Atlantic University (FL)
 Florida International University (FL)
 Florida State University (FL)
 Georgia Institute of Technology (GA)
 Georgia Southern University (GA)
 Georgia State University (GA)
 Illinois State University (IL)
 Indiana State University (IN)
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Iowa State University (IA)
 Kansas State University (KS)
 Kent State University (OH)
 Lamar University (TX)
 Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College (LA)
 Louisiana Tech University (LA)
 Miami University-Oxford (OH)
 Michigan State University (MI)
 Middle Tennessee State University (TN)
 Mississippi State University (MS)
 Missouri University of Science & Technology (MO)
 Montana State University-Bozeman (MT)
 New Mexico State University (NM)
 North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University (NC)
 North Carolina State University (NC)
 North Dakota State University (ND)
 Northern Arizona University (AZ)
 Oakland University (MI)
 Ohio University (OH)
 Oregon State University (OR)
 Portland State University (OR)
 South Dakota State University (SD)
 Southern Illinois University Carbondale (IL)
 Stony Brook University (NY)
 SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry (NY)
 Temple University (PA)
 Tennessee State University (TN)
 Texas A&M University - Commerce (TX)
 Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi (TX)
 Texas A&M University - Kingsville (TX)
 Texas Southern University (TX)
 Texas Tech University (TX)
 Texas Woman's University (TX)
 The Ohio State University (OH)
 The University at Albany, SUNY (NY)
 The University of New Orleans (LA)
 The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (TN)
 The University of Texas at Arlington (TX)
 The University of Texas at Dallas (TX)
 The University of Texas at El Paso (TX)
 The University of Texas at San Antonio (TX)
 The University of West Florida (FL)
 University at Buffalo, State University of New York (NY)
 University of Akron (OH)
 University of Alabama (AL)
 University of Alabama at Birmingham (AL)
 University of Alabama in Huntsville (AL)
 University of Alaska Fairbanks (AK)
 University of Arkansas (AR)
 University of Arkansas at Little Rock (AR)
 University of Central Florida (FL)
 University of Cincinnati (OH)
 University of Colorado Boulder (CO)
 University of Colorado Denver (CO)
 University of Connecticut (CT)
 University of Delaware (DE)
 University of Georgia (GA)
 University of Houston (TX)
 University of Idaho (ID)
 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (IL)
 University of Kansas (KS)
 University of Louisiana at Lafayette (LA)
 University of Maryland (MD)
 University of Maryland, Baltimore County (MD)
 University of Massachusetts Amherst (MA)
 University of Massachusetts Boston (MA)
 University of Massachusetts Lowell (MA)
 University of Memphis (TN)
 University of Mississippi (MS)
 University of Missouri-St. Louis (MO)
 University of Montana (MT)
 University of Nebraska at Lincoln (NE)
 University of Nebraska at Omaha (NE)
 University of Nevada, Reno (NV)
 University of New Hampshire (NH)
 University of North Carolina at Charlotte (NC)
 University of North Dakota (ND)
 University of North Texas (TX)
 University of Oklahoma (OK)
 University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez (PR)
 University of Rhode Island (RI)
 University of South Alabama (AL)
 University of South Carolina Columbia (SC)
 University of South Dakota (SD)
 University of South Florida (FL)
 University of Toledo (OH)
 University of Utah (UT)
 University of Vermont (VT)
 University of Washington-Seattle (WA)
 University of Wisconsin-Madison (WI)
 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (WI)
 Virginia Commonwealth University (VA)
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VA)
 Washington State University (WA)
 West Virginia University (WV)
 Western Michigan University (MI)
 Wichita State University (KS)
 Wright State University (OH)

* Members of the Council of Independent Colleges

Note: For institutions that participated in both 2013 and 2014, only the 2014 data were used in the analysis.

Appendix B: Frequencies by Institutional Control—First-Year Students

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
Higher-Order Learning	Lowest Third	42.8%	37.8%	40.7%
	Middle Third	30.2%	31.6%	30.8%
	Highest Third	27.0%	30.6%	28.5%
HOapply Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Very little	3.5%	2.9%	3.3%
	Some	23.3%	21.4%	22.6%
	Quite a bit	44.2%	45.6%	44.8%
	Very much	29.0%	30.1%	29.4%
HOanalyze Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Very little	4.1%	2.9%	3.6%
	Some	24.6%	21.1%	23.2%
	Quite a bit	42.3%	43.4%	42.7%
	Very much	29.0%	32.6%	30.5%
HOevaluate Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Very little	4.7%	3.2%	4.1%
	Some	26.7%	23.1%	25.3%
	Quite a bit	42.7%	44.3%	43.4%
	Very much	25.8%	29.4%	27.3%
HOform Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Very little	5.3%	3.7%	4.6%
	Some	27.1%	24.4%	26.0%
	Quite a bit	41.9%	43.4%	42.5%
	Very much	25.8%	28.5%	26.9%
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Lowest Third	28.0%	22.9%	25.9%
	Middle Third	43.8%	44.8%	44.2%
	Highest Third	28.2%	32.2%	29.8%
Rlntegrate Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Never	6.7%	5.5%	6.2%
	Sometimes	38.1%	37.5%	37.8%
	Often	36.4%	37.4%	36.8%
	Very often	18.8%	19.5%	19.1%
RIsocietal Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Never	9.0%	6.5%	8.0%
	Sometimes	39.7%	37.3%	38.7%
	Often	34.5%	36.8%	35.5%
	Very often	16.8%	19.4%	17.8%
RIdiverse Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Never	10.8%	6.8%	9.2%
	Sometimes	40.7%	37.7%	39.4%
	Often	32.5%	36.2%	34.0%
	Very often	16.0%	19.4%	17.4%
Rlownview Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Never	5.3%	4.0%	4.8%
	Sometimes	34.0%	31.3%	32.9%
	Often	41.4%	43.4%	42.2%
	Very often	19.3%	21.3%	20.1%
Rlperspect Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Never	4.0%	3.0%	3.5%
	Sometimes	30.8%	29.0%	30.1%
	Often	41.6%	43.4%	42.4%
	Very often	23.6%	24.6%	24.0%
RInewview Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Never	3.1%	2.3%	2.8%
	Sometimes	32.5%	29.3%	31.2%
	Often	41.8%	43.2%	42.4%
	Very often	22.6%	25.2%	23.7%
Rlconnect Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Never	1.6%	1.1%	1.4%
	Sometimes	22.2%	18.7%	20.7%
	Often	44.7%	45.7%	45.1%
	Very often	31.5%	34.6%	32.7%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
Quantitative Reasoning				
QRconclude Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Lowest Third	46.1%	47.4%	46.6%
	Middle Third	13.1%	13.1%	13.1%
	Highest Third	40.8%	39.5%	40.3%
QRproblem Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Never	13.4%	15.0%	14.0%
	Sometimes	35.5%	35.8%	35.6%
	Often	33.7%	33.0%	33.4%
	Very often	17.5%	16.2%	16.9%
QRevaluate Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Never	22.3%	22.9%	22.5%
	Sometimes	40.1%	40.8%	40.4%
	Often	25.7%	25.3%	25.6%
	Very often	11.9%	11.0%	11.5%
Learning Strategies				
LSreading Identified key information from reading assignments	Lowest Third	27.7%	25.3%	26.7%
	Middle Third	46.2%	47.0%	46.6%
	Highest Third	26.0%	27.7%	26.7%
LSnotes Reviewed your notes after class	Never	1.6%	1.0%	1.4%
	Sometimes	18.8%	14.8%	17.2%
	Often	43.7%	42.5%	43.2%
	Very often	35.9%	41.6%	38.2%
LSsummary Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Never	6.7%	5.9%	6.3%
	Sometimes	31.0%	30.2%	30.7%
	Often	35.5%	35.9%	35.7%
	Very often	26.8%	28.0%	27.3%
Collaborative Learning				
CLaskhelp Asked another student to help you understand course material	Lowest Third	39.3%	36.3%	38.1%
	Middle Third	38.1%	39.5%	38.7%
	Highest Third	22.7%	24.2%	23.3%
CLexplain Explained course material to one or more students	Never	7.9%	7.2%	7.6%
	Sometimes	40.4%	40.2%	40.3%
	Often	33.8%	34.8%	34.2%
	Very often	17.9%	17.7%	17.8%
CLstudy Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Never	13.7%	11.5%	12.8%
	Sometimes	36.6%	35.2%	36.1%
	Often	30.1%	31.8%	30.8%
	Very often	19.5%	21.4%	20.3%
CLproject Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Never	7.6%	6.0%	6.9%
	Sometimes	40.5%	38.7%	39.8%
	Often	34.5%	36.5%	35.3%
	Very often	17.4%	18.9%	18.0%

First-Year Students		Variables	Institutional Control		
			Public	Private	Total
		Response labels	N%	N%	N%
Discussions with Diverse Others		Lowest Third	36.8%	36.8%	36.8%
		Middle Third	32.1%	33.7%	32.8%
		Highest Third	31.1%	29.5%	30.4%
DDrace Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own		Never	4.9%	3.9%	4.5%
		Sometimes	24.3%	23.0%	23.8%
		Often	29.6%	29.0%	29.3%
		Very often	41.2%	44.1%	42.4%
DDeconomic Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own		Never	4.6%	3.4%	4.1%
		Sometimes	22.5%	20.6%	21.8%
		Often	34.1%	33.6%	33.9%
		Very often	38.8%	42.4%	40.3%
DDreligion Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own		Never	5.9%	6.5%	6.2%
		Sometimes	24.0%	26.4%	25.0%
		Often	30.6%	28.7%	29.8%
		Very often	39.6%	38.4%	39.1%
DDpolitical Had discussions with people with political views other than your own		Never	6.4%	5.7%	6.1%
		Sometimes	24.4%	26.8%	25.4%
		Often	31.5%	30.9%	31.3%
		Very often	37.7%	36.6%	37.2%
Student-Faculty Interaction		Lowest Third	49.9%	42.8%	47.0%
		Middle Third	24.6%	27.6%	25.8%
		Highest Third	25.5%	29.6%	27.2%
SFCareer Talked about career plans with a faculty member		Never	22.1%	18.6%	20.7%
		Sometimes	45.8%	46.9%	46.3%
		Often	21.3%	23.4%	22.1%
		Very often	10.8%	11.2%	11.0%
SFotherwork Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)		Never	53.1%	47.1%	50.7%
		Sometimes	28.7%	33.1%	30.5%
		Often	11.9%	13.2%	12.4%
		Very often	6.2%	6.6%	6.4%
SFdiscuss Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class		Never	33.8%	25.7%	30.5%
		Sometimes	42.3%	45.8%	43.7%
		Often	16.7%	20.1%	18.1%
		Very often	7.2%	8.4%	7.7%
SFperform Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member		Never	26.2%	20.5%	23.9%
		Sometimes	46.5%	48.3%	47.2%
		Often	19.0%	22.0%	20.2%
		Very often	8.4%	9.2%	8.7%
Effective Teaching Practices		Lowest Third	43.3%	37.2%	40.8%
		Middle Third	32.4%	34.4%	33.2%
		Highest Third	24.2%	28.5%	26.0%
ETgoals Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements		Very little	1.9%	1.4%	1.7%
		Some	17.4%	15.3%	16.5%
		Quite a bit	45.0%	45.6%	45.3%
		Very much	35.7%	37.6%	36.5%
ETorganize Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way		Very little	2.5%	1.9%	2.2%
		Some	18.7%	15.9%	17.6%
		Quite a bit	46.2%	46.5%	46.3%
		Very much	32.6%	35.7%	33.9%
ETexample Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points		Very little	3.0%	2.3%	2.8%
		Some	20.1%	17.7%	19.1%
		Quite a bit	41.6%	41.6%	41.6%
		Very much	35.2%	38.4%	36.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
ETdraftfb Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Very little	8.3%	6.0%	7.3%
	Some	28.9%	25.0%	27.3%
	Quite a bit	35.5%	37.3%	36.2%
	Very much	27.4%	31.8%	29.2%
ETfeedback Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Very little	9.2%	5.8%	7.8%
	Some	30.9%	26.9%	29.3%
	Quite a bit	36.5%	39.7%	37.8%
	Very much	23.4%	27.6%	25.1%
Quality of Interactions		Lowest Third	30.7%	35.4%
		Middle Third	33.9%	33.2%
		Highest Third	35.4%	31.4%
QIstudentR Quality of interactions with students	Poor	1.5%	1.2%	1.4%
	2	2.1%	1.6%	1.9%
	3	4.6%	3.6%	4.2%
	4	10.2%	8.1%	9.4%
	5	23.2%	20.7%	22.2%
	6	29.4%	31.2%	30.2%
	Excellent	28.4%	33.1%	30.3%
	Not applicable	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
QIadvisorR Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Poor	4.4%	3.2%	3.9%
	2	5.8%	4.5%	5.3%
	3	8.6%	7.5%	8.2%
	4	14.0%	12.8%	13.5%
	5	19.5%	19.8%	19.6%
	6	21.2%	22.7%	21.8%
	Excellent	24.0%	27.8%	25.6%
	Not applicable	2.6%	1.7%	2.2%
QIfacultyR Quality of interactions with faculty	Poor	2.2%	1.2%	1.8%
	2	3.8%	2.1%	3.1%
	3	7.2%	4.8%	6.2%
	4	14.5%	11.2%	13.2%
	5	25.3%	23.3%	24.4%
	6	27.3%	31.5%	29.0%
	Excellent	18.7%	25.3%	21.5%
	Not applicable	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%
QIstaffR Quality of interactions with student services staff	Poor	5.0%	3.5%	4.4%
	2	5.0%	4.3%	4.7%
	3	7.8%	6.9%	7.4%
	4	14.0%	13.2%	13.7%
	5	20.8%	21.2%	20.9%
	6	21.3%	23.4%	22.1%
	Excellent	17.0%	20.1%	18.3%
	Not applicable	9.2%	7.5%	8.5%
QIadminR Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Poor	5.6%	3.8%	4.8%
	2	6.4%	5.1%	5.9%
	3	8.9%	7.7%	8.4%
	4	15.4%	13.9%	14.8%
	5	20.7%	21.3%	20.9%
	6	20.1%	22.9%	21.2%
	Excellent	15.6%	20.1%	17.5%
	Not applicable	7.3%	5.2%	6.4%

First-Year Students		Variables	Institutional Control		
			Public	Private	Total
		Response labels	N%	N%	N%
Supportive Environment		Lowest Third	38.6%	33.7%	36.6%
		Middle Third	34.3%	35.4%	34.8%
		Highest Third	27.1%	30.9%	28.7%
SEacademic Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically		Very little	3.5%	2.6%	3.1%
		Some	18.6%	15.9%	17.5%
		Quite a bit	40.7%	39.5%	40.2%
		Very much	37.2%	42.0%	39.2%
SElearnsup Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)		Very little	5.2%	4.4%	4.9%
		Some	16.4%	15.5%	16.1%
		Quite a bit	36.2%	35.2%	35.8%
		Very much	42.1%	44.9%	43.3%
SEdiverse Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)		Very little	11.7%	10.1%	11.0%
		Some	29.6%	28.1%	29.0%
		Quite a bit	32.8%	33.0%	32.9%
		Very much	26.0%	28.7%	27.1%
SEsocial Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially		Very little	5.2%	4.4%	4.9%
		Some	21.4%	18.9%	20.4%
		Quite a bit	38.4%	37.9%	38.2%
		Very much	35.0%	38.8%	36.6%
SEwellness Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)		Very little	5.7%	5.3%	5.5%
		Some	20.7%	20.1%	20.4%
		Quite a bit	38.4%	38.6%	38.5%
		Very much	35.3%	36.1%	35.6%
SEnonacad Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)		Very little	20.2%	17.7%	19.2%
		Some	35.4%	35.6%	35.5%
		Quite a bit	28.1%	29.6%	28.7%
		Very much	16.3%	17.1%	16.6%
SEactivities Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)		Very little	6.9%	6.5%	6.7%
		Some	23.9%	21.0%	22.7%
		Quite a bit	37.9%	38.1%	38.0%
		Very much	31.3%	34.4%	32.6%
SEevents Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues		Very little	13.7%	10.7%	12.5%
		Some	33.4%	29.7%	31.8%
		Quite a bit	32.5%	35.0%	33.5%
		Very much	20.4%	24.6%	22.1%
Perceived Gains in Learning and Development		Lowest Third	35.2%	30.7%	33.3%
		Middle Third	35.5%	36.7%	36.0%
		Highest Third	29.2%	32.6%	30.6%
PGwrite Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively		Very little	8.2%	5.8%	7.2%
		Some	26.2%	23.6%	25.1%
		Quite a bit	39.8%	41.1%	40.3%
		Very much	25.8%	29.5%	27.3%
PGspeak Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively		Very little	12.2%	9.9%	11.2%
		Some	30.6%	29.9%	30.3%
		Quite a bit	36.1%	37.6%	36.7%
		Very much	21.0%	22.6%	21.7%
PGthink Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically		Very little	3.5%	2.8%	3.2%
		Some	19.7%	16.8%	18.5%
		Quite a bit	42.9%	42.5%	42.7%
		Very much	33.9%	37.9%	35.5%
PGanalyze Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information		Very little	13.1%	16.8%	14.7%
		Some	31.2%	32.5%	31.7%
		Quite a bit	34.4%	31.4%	33.2%
		Very much	21.3%	19.3%	20.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
PGwork Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Very little	14.5%	11.8%	13.4%
	Some	31.7%	30.5%	31.2%
	Quite a bit	32.9%	34.3%	33.5%
	Very much	20.9%	23.3%	21.9%
PGothers Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Very little	7.3%	6.0%	6.8%
	Some	27.7%	26.0%	27.0%
	Quite a bit	39.3%	40.2%	39.7%
	Very much	25.8%	27.7%	26.6%
PGvalues Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Very little	13.6%	9.2%	11.8%
	Some	29.5%	25.7%	27.9%
	Quite a bit	33.9%	35.8%	34.7%
	Very much	23.0%	29.4%	25.6%
PGdiverse Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Very little	11.5%	10.0%	10.8%
	Some	29.3%	28.2%	28.9%
	Quite a bit	34.4%	34.8%	34.6%
	Very much	24.7%	27.1%	25.7%
PGprobsolve Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Very little	13.0%	11.5%	12.4%
	Some	33.2%	32.8%	33.1%
	Quite a bit	33.8%	34.7%	34.2%
	Very much	20.0%	21.1%	20.4%
PGcitizen Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Very little	13.2%	11.4%	12.5%
	Some	32.5%	30.6%	31.7%
	Quite a bit	33.7%	34.7%	34.1%
	Very much	20.5%	23.3%	21.7%
Satisfaction with the Institutional Experience		Lowest Third	50.0%	44.2%
		Middle Third	22.6%	21.0%
		Highest Third	27.4%	34.7%
evalexp How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Poor	1.6%	1.3%	1.5%
	Fair	11.4%	9.4%	10.6%
	Good	51.1%	44.0%	48.1%
	Excellent	36.0%	45.2%	39.8%
sameinst If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Definitely no	3.4%	3.6%	3.5%
	Probably no	11.9%	11.6%	11.8%
	Probably yes	41.6%	38.2%	40.2%
	Definitely yes	43.0%	46.6%	44.5%
Additional Items				
tmprephrs Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	0 hrs	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%
	1-5 hrs	14.5%	10.7%	13.0%
	6-10 hrs	24.4%	21.3%	23.1%
	11-15 hrs	21.6%	21.5%	21.6%
	16-20 hrs	17.2%	19.3%	18.1%
	21-25 hrs	10.7%	12.9%	11.6%
	26-30 hrs	5.7%	7.4%	6.4%
	> 30 hrs	5.4%	6.6%	5.9%
reading Of the time you spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how many hours are on ASSIGNED READING?	Very little	11.5%	6.1%	9.4%
	Some	31.9%	25.1%	29.2%
	About half	29.4%	31.2%	30.1%
	Most	20.0%	27.2%	22.8%
	Almost all	7.2%	10.4%	8.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
wrshort Number of written papers or reports: Up to 5 pages	None	5.1%	2.3%	3.9%
	1-2	20.7%	14.1%	18.0%
	3-5	32.5%	28.5%	30.9%
	6-10	24.3%	27.7%	25.7%
	11-15	9.4%	13.7%	11.2%
	16-20	4.0%	6.7%	5.1%
	> 20 papers	3.9%	7.0%	5.2%
wrmed Number of written papers or reports: Between 6 and 10 pages	None	35.4%	23.6%	30.5%
	1-2	41.8%	44.7%	43.0%
	3-5	16.1%	22.8%	18.8%
	6-10	5.0%	6.8%	5.7%
	11-15	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%
	16-20	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
	> 20 papers	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
wrlong Number of written papers or reports: 11 pages or more	None	78.4%	71.1%	75.4%
	1-2	16.0%	22.9%	18.8%
	3-5	2.7%	3.3%	3.0%
	6-10	1.4%	1.1%	1.3%
	11-15	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
	16-20	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
	> 20 papers	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
challenge To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	1 Not at all	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
	2	1.0%	0.8%	0.9%
	3	3.0%	2.5%	2.8%
	4	10.2%	8.5%	9.5%
	5	32.4%	30.6%	31.6%
	6	31.9%	34.8%	33.1%
	7 Very Much	21.2%	22.5%	21.7%
empstudy Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Very little	1.6%	1.2%	1.4%
	Some	14.7%	12.7%	13.9%
	Quite a bit	44.6%	44.0%	44.3%
	Very much	39.2%	42.0%	40.4%

Appendix C: Frequencies by Institutional Control—Seniors

Variables	Seniors	Institutional Control		
		Public		Private
		N%	N%	N%
	Response labels			
Higher-Order Learning				
HOapply Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Lowest Third	36.4%	31.7%	34.7%
	Middle Third	37.8%	40.5%	38.8%
	Highest Third	25.8%	27.9%	26.5%
HOanalyze Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Very little	2.8%	2.3%	2.6%
	Some	17.5%	16.3%	17.1%
	Quite a bit	41.9%	43.3%	42.4%
	Very much	37.8%	38.2%	37.9%
HOevaluate Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Very little	3.7%	2.6%	3.3%
	Some	19.6%	17.3%	18.8%
	Quite a bit	39.9%	41.2%	40.3%
	Very much	36.8%	38.9%	37.6%
HOform Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Very little	5.7%	3.5%	4.9%
	Some	24.3%	20.5%	22.9%
	Quite a bit	39.4%	41.8%	40.3%
	Very much	30.6%	34.2%	31.9%
Reflective & Integrative Learning				
Rlintegrate Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Lowest Third	41.9%	36.0%	39.8%
	Middle Third	25.5%	26.8%	26.0%
	Highest Third	32.6%	37.1%	34.2%
Rlsocietal Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Never	2.9%	2.5%	2.7%
	Sometimes	24.5%	24.7%	24.5%
	Often	39.3%	39.8%	39.5%
	Very often	33.3%	33.1%	33.2%
Rldiverse Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Never	12.0%	6.0%	9.9%
	Sometimes	34.8%	31.7%	33.7%
	Often	30.4%	35.0%	32.0%
	Very often	22.8%	27.4%	24.4%
Rlownview Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Never	5.0%	3.1%	4.3%
	Sometimes	30.6%	26.9%	29.3%
	Often	40.0%	42.5%	40.9%
	Very often	24.5%	27.6%	25.6%
Rlperspect Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Never	3.6%	2.3%	3.2%
	Sometimes	27.2%	24.6%	26.3%
	Often	41.0%	43.0%	41.7%
	Very often	28.1%	30.1%	28.8%
Rlnewview Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Never	2.3%	1.5%	2.0%
	Sometimes	28.4%	25.2%	27.3%
	Often	41.6%	42.7%	42.0%
	Very often	27.7%	30.6%	28.8%
Rlconnect Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Never	1.1%	0.7%	1.0%
	Sometimes	15.3%	13.0%	14.5%
	Often	41.9%	41.7%	41.8%
	Very often	41.7%	44.6%	42.7%

Seniors		Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
Variables	Response labels	N%		N%
		N%	N%	
Quantitative Reasoning	Lowest Third	40.9%	42.1%	41.3%
	Middle Third	38.5%	37.9%	38.3%
	Highest Third	20.6%	20.0%	20.4%
QRconclude Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Never	13.3%	14.7%	13.8%
	Sometimes	32.5%	33.4%	32.8%
	Often	32.4%	31.2%	32.0%
	Very often	21.8%	20.6%	21.4%
QRproblem Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Never	19.6%	19.4%	19.5%
	Sometimes	36.6%	37.3%	36.8%
	Often	26.9%	27.1%	27.0%
	Very often	16.9%	16.2%	16.7%
QRevaluate Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Never	18.1%	18.0%	18.1%
	Sometimes	37.8%	37.9%	37.8%
	Often	28.2%	28.4%	28.3%
	Very often	15.9%	15.7%	15.8%
Learning Strategies	Lowest Third	26.4%	25.2%	26.0%
	Middle Third	44.2%	45.5%	44.6%
	Highest Third	29.4%	29.3%	29.4%
LSreading Identified key information from reading assignments	Never	2.0%	1.3%	1.8%
	Sometimes	15.7%	13.0%	14.7%
	Often	38.5%	37.8%	38.2%
	Very often	43.8%	47.9%	45.3%
LSnotes Reviewed your notes after class	Never	7.0%	7.8%	7.3%
	Sometimes	29.4%	30.8%	29.9%
	Often	30.9%	30.3%	30.7%
	Very often	32.7%	31.1%	32.1%
LSsummary Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Never	7.0%	6.4%	6.8%
	Sometimes	28.2%	28.2%	28.2%
	Often	34.1%	34.8%	34.4%
	Very often	30.7%	30.6%	30.7%
Collaborative Learning	Lowest Third	37.4%	38.5%	37.8%
	Middle Third	37.0%	36.8%	36.9%
	Highest Third	25.5%	24.7%	25.2%
CLaskhelp Asked another student to help you understand course material	Never	12.0%	13.3%	12.5%
	Sometimes	44.9%	45.3%	45.0%
	Often	28.2%	27.6%	28.0%
	Very often	14.9%	13.8%	14.5%
Clexplain Explained course material to one or more students	Never	4.1%	6.0%	4.8%
	Sometimes	35.5%	35.3%	35.4%
	Often	38.2%	37.2%	37.9%
	Very often	22.2%	21.5%	21.9%
CLstudy Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Never	16.4%	17.1%	16.6%
	Sometimes	36.1%	34.7%	35.6%
	Often	27.2%	28.1%	27.5%
	Very often	20.3%	20.2%	20.2%
CLproject Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Never	5.7%	6.6%	6.1%
	Sometimes	29.4%	29.9%	29.6%
	Often	34.9%	35.1%	35.0%
	Very often	30.0%	28.4%	29.4%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
Discussions with Diverse Others	Lowest Third	34.5%	38.1%	35.8%
	Middle Third	31.5%	32.7%	31.9%
	Highest Third	34.1%	29.2%	32.3%
DDrace Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	Never	4.9%	4.3%	4.7%
	Sometimes	23.3%	24.5%	23.8%
	Often	28.0%	28.3%	28.1%
	Very often	43.8%	42.9%	43.5%
DEconomic Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	Never	4.1%	3.4%	3.8%
	Sometimes	21.6%	21.8%	21.6%
	Often	33.1%	33.1%	33.1%
	Very often	41.3%	41.8%	41.5%
DDreligion Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	Never	5.4%	6.9%	5.9%
	Sometimes	23.2%	28.9%	25.3%
	Often	30.0%	27.7%	29.2%
	Very often	41.4%	36.4%	39.6%
DDpolitical Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	Never	5.2%	4.7%	5.0%
	Sometimes	23.0%	26.7%	24.3%
	Often	31.2%	31.5%	31.3%
	Very often	40.6%	37.1%	39.3%
Student-Faculty Interaction	Lowest Third	39.4%	33.4%	37.3%
	Middle Third	32.2%	33.3%	32.6%
	Highest Third	28.3%	33.4%	30.1%
SFcareer Talked about career plans with a faculty member	Never	17.6%	14.3%	16.4%
	Sometimes	39.7%	36.8%	38.7%
	Often	24.6%	27.1%	25.5%
	Very often	18.1%	21.8%	19.4%
SFotherwork Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Never	44.2%	38.6%	42.2%
	Sometimes	28.7%	30.4%	29.3%
	Often	15.0%	17.5%	15.9%
	Very often	12.0%	13.4%	12.5%
SFdiscuss Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	Never	25.3%	21.4%	23.9%
	Sometimes	40.9%	39.6%	40.4%
	Often	21.2%	24.0%	22.2%
	Very often	12.6%	15.1%	13.5%
SFperform Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	Never	22.7%	20.1%	21.8%
	Sometimes	44.1%	43.8%	44.0%
	Often	21.1%	22.7%	21.7%
	Very often	12.1%	13.3%	12.5%
Effective Teaching Practices	Lowest Third	40.1%	34.7%	38.2%
	Middle Third	31.6%	33.2%	32.2%
	Highest Third	28.3%	32.1%	29.6%
ETgoals Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	Very little	2.0%	1.4%	1.8%
	Some	15.8%	13.6%	15.0%
	Quite a bit	42.9%	43.5%	43.1%
	Very much	39.3%	41.5%	40.1%
ETorganize Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	Very little	2.5%	1.8%	2.2%
	Some	17.2%	14.2%	16.2%
	Quite a bit	44.7%	44.9%	44.8%
	Very much	35.6%	39.1%	36.9%
ETexample Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	Very little	3.0%	2.4%	2.8%
	Some	17.4%	15.6%	16.8%
	Quite a bit	39.9%	39.7%	39.8%
	Very much	39.7%	42.3%	40.6%

Seniors		Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
Variables	Response labels	N%	N%	N%
	Very little	10.8%	8.2%	9.9%
ETdraftfb	Some	28.4%	25.6%	27.4%
	Quite a bit	32.9%	34.3%	33.4%
	Very much	27.9%	31.9%	29.3%
	ETfeedback	Very little	7.3%	4.8%
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Some	26.9%	23.3%	25.6%
	Quite a bit	37.9%	39.9%	38.6%
	Very much	27.9%	32.0%	29.4%
	Quality of Interactions	Lowest Third	43.2%	35.7%
QIstudentR	Middle Third	26.0%	26.9%	26.3%
	Highest Third	30.8%	37.5%	33.2%
	Quality of interactions with students	Poor	1.1%	0.9%
	2	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
QIadvisorR	3	3.7%	3.2%	3.5%
	4	8.5%	7.4%	8.1%
	5	21.6%	20.0%	21.0%
	6	30.7%	30.7%	30.7%
QIfacultyR	Excellent	32.0%	35.4%	33.2%
	Not applicable	0.8%	1.1%	0.9%
	Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Poor	5.6%	3.7%
	2	5.9%	4.3%	5.3%
QIstaffR	3	7.9%	6.2%	7.3%
	4	12.4%	10.4%	11.7%
	5	17.7%	16.9%	17.4%
	6	20.8%	22.0%	21.2%
QIadminR	Excellent	28.3%	35.1%	30.8%
	Not applicable	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%
	Quality of interactions with faculty	Poor	1.6%	0.9%
	2	2.3%	1.4%	2.0%
QIstaffR	3	4.7%	3.1%	4.2%
	4	10.8%	8.0%	9.8%
	5	22.6%	19.8%	21.6%
	6	30.9%	32.8%	31.6%
QIadminR	Excellent	26.5%	33.4%	28.9%
	Not applicable	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
	Quality of interactions with student services staff	Poor	5.2%	4.5%
	2	5.1%	4.9%	5.0%
QIadminR	3	7.3%	7.2%	7.3%
	4	13.0%	12.7%	12.9%
	5	18.3%	18.9%	18.5%
	6	18.1%	19.5%	18.6%
QIadminR	Excellent	15.5%	18.3%	16.5%
	Not applicable	17.5%	14.2%	16.3%
	Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Poor	6.2%	4.6%
	2	6.3%	5.4%	6.0%
QIadminR	3	8.9%	8.2%	8.7%
	4	15.4%	14.2%	15.0%
	5	21.0%	20.9%	21.0%
	6	20.6%	22.2%	21.1%
QIadminR	Excellent	16.5%	21.5%	18.3%
	Not applicable	5.1%	3.1%	4.4%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
Supportive Environment	Lowest Third	38.3%	31.8%	35.9%
	Middle Third	34.8%	35.7%	35.1%
	Highest Third	27.0%	32.5%	29.0%
SEacademic Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	Very little	5.1%	3.4%	4.5%
	Some	23.6%	18.8%	21.8%
	Quite a bit	41.9%	41.5%	41.8%
	Very much	29.4%	36.3%	31.9%
SElearnup Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	Very little	8.8%	6.7%	8.1%
	Some	25.2%	21.9%	24.0%
	Quite a bit	37.1%	37.9%	37.4%
	Very much	28.9%	33.5%	30.6%
SEdiverse Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	Very little	16.4%	13.9%	15.5%
	Some	32.5%	30.9%	31.9%
	Quite a bit	30.0%	31.0%	30.4%
	Very much	21.1%	24.3%	22.3%
SEsocial Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	Very little	7.7%	6.9%	7.4%
	Some	25.3%	22.3%	24.2%
	Quite a bit	38.4%	37.8%	38.2%
	Very much	28.7%	33.0%	30.2%
SEwellness Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	Very little	10.0%	9.3%	9.8%
	Some	25.5%	24.7%	25.2%
	Quite a bit	36.7%	37.0%	36.8%
	Very much	27.8%	29.0%	28.2%
SEnonacad Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	Very little	34.2%	28.2%	32.0%
	Some	34.8%	35.8%	35.2%
	Quite a bit	20.1%	22.9%	21.1%
	Very much	11.0%	13.1%	11.7%
SEactivities Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	Very little	12.2%	11.8%	12.0%
	Some	29.2%	24.9%	27.6%
	Quite a bit	35.1%	36.3%	35.5%
	Very much	23.6%	27.0%	24.8%
SEevents Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	Very little	17.3%	15.0%	16.5%
	Some	36.6%	31.8%	34.9%
	Quite a bit	30.0%	32.7%	31.0%
	Very much	16.0%	20.5%	17.6%
Perceived Gains in Learning and Development	Lowest Third	39.2%	32.3%	36.7%
	Middle Third	32.3%	34.7%	33.2%
	Highest Third	28.5%	33.0%	30.1%
PGwrite Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	Very little	6.6%	4.1%	5.7%
	Some	21.8%	17.0%	20.1%
	Quite a bit	36.4%	36.4%	36.4%
	Very much	35.2%	42.5%	37.8%
PGspeak Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	Very little	8.2%	5.8%	7.3%
	Some	23.8%	19.8%	22.4%
	Quite a bit	36.0%	37.0%	36.4%
	Very much	31.9%	37.4%	33.9%
PGthink Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	Very little	2.7%	1.7%	2.3%
	Some	13.1%	9.9%	12.0%
	Quite a bit	36.6%	34.1%	35.7%
	Very much	47.7%	54.3%	50.1%
PGanalyze Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	Very little	10.9%	12.5%	11.5%
	Some	26.5%	28.3%	27.2%
	Quite a bit	31.6%	29.9%	31.0%
	Very much	31.0%	29.3%	30.4%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
PGwork Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Very little	9.0%	7.2%	8.3%
	Some	22.7%	21.7%	22.4%
	Quite a bit	32.7%	33.1%	32.8%
	Very much	35.6%	38.1%	36.5%
PGothers Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Very little	5.5%	3.9%	4.9%
	Some	21.4%	19.0%	20.5%
	Quite a bit	36.6%	37.4%	36.9%
	Very much	36.5%	39.7%	37.7%
PGvalues Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Very little	13.5%	7.4%	11.3%
	Some	25.9%	20.8%	24.1%
	Quite a bit	31.0%	32.9%	31.7%
	Very much	29.6%	38.9%	33.0%
PGdiverse Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Very little	11.4%	9.1%	10.6%
	Some	27.7%	26.3%	27.2%
	Quite a bit	31.6%	32.8%	32.0%
	Very much	29.4%	31.8%	30.3%
PGprobsolve Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Very little	10.3%	8.1%	9.5%
	Some	27.5%	26.3%	27.0%
	Quite a bit	33.8%	35.5%	34.4%
	Very much	28.5%	30.1%	29.1%
PGcitizen Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Very little	13.7%	10.2%	12.4%
	Some	29.7%	27.5%	28.9%
	Quite a bit	31.5%	33.6%	32.3%
	Very much	25.1%	28.7%	26.4%
Satisfaction with the Institutional Experience		Lowest Third	40.8%	45.7%
		Middle Third	18.8%	19.5%
		Highest Third	40.4%	34.8%
evalexp How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Poor	2.2%	1.5%	2.0%
	Fair	11.1%	8.0%	10.0%
	Good	46.5%	38.6%	43.6%
	Excellent	40.2%	51.9%	44.4%
sameinst If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Definitely no	4.4%	4.2%	4.3%
	Probably no	12.4%	11.9%	12.2%
	Probably yes	39.1%	35.0%	37.6%
	Definitely yes	44.1%	48.9%	45.8%
Additional Items				
tmprephrs Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	0 hrs	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
	1-5 hrs	14.3%	11.9%	13.4%
	6-10 hrs	23.9%	22.7%	23.4%
	11-15 hrs	19.8%	20.1%	19.9%
	16-20 hrs	16.8%	18.2%	17.3%
	21-25 hrs	10.3%	11.5%	10.7%
	26-30 hrs	6.4%	7.2%	6.7%
	> 30 hrs	8.2%	8.1%	8.2%
reading Of the time you spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how many hours are on ASSIGNED READING?	Very little	13.5%	8.6%	11.8%
	Some	26.5%	22.5%	25.2%
	About half	26.6%	28.4%	27.2%
	Most	23.1%	28.0%	24.8%
	Almost all	10.4%	12.4%	11.1%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Institutional Control		
		Public	Private	Total
		N%	N%	N%
wrshort Number of written papers or reports: Up to 5 pages	None	6.1%	3.4%	5.1%
	1-2	20.3%	15.1%	18.5%
	3-5	28.3%	26.7%	27.7%
	6-10	21.3%	24.1%	22.3%
	11-15	10.3%	12.5%	11.1%
	16-20	5.8%	7.5%	6.4%
	> 20 papers	7.9%	10.7%	8.9%
wrmed Number of written papers or reports: Between 6 and 10 pages	None	22.7%	14.2%	19.6%
	1-2	36.5%	34.4%	35.7%
	3-5	25.1%	31.0%	27.2%
	6-10	10.5%	14.0%	11.8%
	11-15	3.1%	3.9%	3.4%
	16-20	1.2%	1.4%	1.3%
	> 20 papers	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%
wrlong Number of written papers or reports: 11 pages or more	None	44.6%	34.6%	41.0%
	1-2	37.2%	43.2%	39.4%
	3-5	11.3%	15.0%	12.7%
	6-10	3.6%	4.1%	3.8%
	11-15	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
	16-20	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
	> 20 papers	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
challenge To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	1 Not at all	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
	2	1.3%	0.9%	1.1%
	3	2.9%	2.4%	2.8%
	4	8.6%	7.4%	8.1%
	5	27.8%	27.1%	27.6%
	6	32.2%	34.2%	32.9%
	7 Very Much	26.7%	27.5%	27.0%
empstudy Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Very little	2.0%	1.5%	1.9%
	Some	16.3%	13.5%	15.3%
	Quite a bit	43.9%	43.6%	43.8%
	Very much	37.8%	41.3%	39.1%

Appendix D: Statistical Comparisons by Institutional Control—First-Year Students

First-Year Students

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Higher-Order Learning	Private	83,600	40.3	13.3	.05			
	Public	121,269	38.7	13.9	.04	1.64	***	.12
Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Private	85,779	3.0	.8	.00			
	Public	124,538	3.0	.8	.00	.04	***	.05
Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Private	85,428	3.1	.8	.00			
	Public	124,036	3.0	.8	.00	.10	***	.12
Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Private	85,448	3.0	.8	.00			
	Public	124,039	2.9	.8	.00	.10	***	.12
Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Private	85,245	3.0	.8	.00			
	Public	123,720	2.9	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Private	86,959	36.7	12.3	.04			
	Public	126,418	35.1	12.6	.04	1.59	***	.13
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Private	88,359	2.7	.8	.00			
	Public	128,768	2.7	.9	.00	.04	***	.04
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Private	87,295	2.7	.9	.00			
	Public	127,020	2.6	.9	.00	.10	***	.12
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Private	87,326	2.7	.9	.00			
	Public	127,074	2.5	.9	.00	.15	***	.17
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Private	87,198	2.8	.8	.00			
	Public	126,716	2.8	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Private	86,936	2.9	.8	.00			
	Public	126,433	2.9	.8	.00	.05	***	.06
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Private	86,644	2.9	.8	.00			
	Public	126,036	2.8	.8	.00	.08	***	.09
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Private	86,178	3.1	.7	.00			
	Public	125,364	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
Quantitative Reasoning	Private	84,949	26.7	16.3	.06			
	Public	123,234	27.2	16.3	.05	-.57	***	-.03
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Private	85,882	2.5	.9	.00			
	Public	124,631	2.6	.9	.00	-.05	***	-.05
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Private	85,676	2.2	.9	.00			
	Public	124,364	2.3	.9	.00	-.03	***	-.03
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Private	85,328	2.3	.9	.00			
	Public	123,771	2.3	.9	.00	-.01	*	-.01
Learning Strategies	Private	78,833	40.2	13.9	.05			
	Public	112,907	39.3	14.1	.04	.92	***	.07
Identified key information from reading assignments	Private	80,458	3.3	.7	.00			
	Public	115,104	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.14
Reviewed your notes after class	Private	80,196	2.9	.9	.00			
	Public	114,795	2.9	.9	.00	-.01		-.01
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Private	79,275	2.9	.9	.00			
	Public	113,562	2.8	.9	.00	.04	***	.04
Collaborative Learning	Private	88,373	33.4	13.7	.05			
	Public	129,318	32.6	13.9	.04	.86	***	.06
Asked another student to help you understand course material	Private	92,240	2.6	.9	.00			
	Public	135,790	2.6	.9	.00	.01	**	.02
Explained course material to one or more students	Private	90,278	2.7	.8	.00			
	Public	132,342	2.7	.8	.00	.01	***	.01
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Private	90,321	2.6	.9	.00			
	Public	132,466	2.6	1.0	.00	.08	***	.08

First-Year Students

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Private	89,997	2.7	.8	.00	.07	***	.08
	Public	131,886	2.6	.9	.00			
Discussions with Diverse Others	Private	79,854	41.3	15.1	.05	.34	***	.02
	Public	114,253	40.9	16.0	.05			
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	Private	80,905	3.1	.9	.00	.06	***	.07
	Public	115,894	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	Private	80,702	3.2	.9	.00	.08	***	.09
	Public	115,579	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	Private	80,516	3.0	1.0	.00	-.05	***	-.05
	Public	115,272	3.0	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	Private	80,239	3.0	.9	.00	-.02	***	-.02
	Public	114,835	3.0	.9	.00			
Student-Faculty Interaction	Private	85,120	21.8	14.2	.05	1.94	***	.13
	Public	123,619	19.9	14.5	.04			
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	Private	86,629	2.3	.9	.00	.06	***	.07
	Public	125,799	2.2	.9	.00			
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Private	86,261	1.8	.9	.00	.08	***	.09
	Public	125,275	1.7	.9	.00			
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	Private	86,144	2.1	.9	.00	.14	***	.16
	Public	125,107	2.0	.9	.00			
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	Private	85,838	2.2	.9	.00	.10	***	.12
	Public	124,640	2.1	.9	.00			
Effective Teaching Practices	Private	85,882	41.4	12.6	.04	1.88	***	.15
	Public	124,680	39.6	13.1	.04			
Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	Private	86,059	3.2	.7	.00	.05	***	.06
	Public	124,903	3.1	.8	.00			
Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	Private	85,806	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Public	124,585	3.1	.8	.00			
Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	Private	85,590	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Public	124,246	3.1	.8	.00			
Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Private	85,578	3.0	.9	.00	.13	***	.14
	Public	124,174	2.8	.9	.00			
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Private	85,192	2.9	.9	.00	.15	***	.17
	Public	123,683	2.7	.9	.00			
Quality of Interactions	Private	77,540	43.3	11.6	.04	2.45	***	.20
	Public	109,326	40.9	12.4	.04			
Quality of interactions with students	Private	80,067	5.7	1.3	.01	.18	***	.13
	Public	114,452	5.6	1.4	.00			
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Private	79,871	5.3	1.7	.01	.18	***	.10
	Public	114,199	5.1	1.8	.01			
Quality of interactions with faculty	Private	79,451	5.5	1.4	.01	.33	***	.23
	Public	113,578	5.2	1.5	.00			
Quality of interactions with student services staff	Private	79,555	5.4	1.9	.01	.12	***	.06
	Public	113,802	5.3	2.0	.01			
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Private	79,613	5.2	1.8	.01	.18	***	.09
	Public	113,820	5.1	2.0	.01			

First-Year Students

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Supportive Environment								
Private	74,930	39.0	13.3	.05				
Public	105,545	37.5	13.7	.04		1.47	***	.11
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	Private	75,199	3.2	.8	.00			
	Public	105,899	3.1	.8	.00	.10	***	.12
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	Private	75,166	3.2	.9	.00			
	Public	105,966	3.2	.9	.00	.05	***	.06
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	Private	75,296	2.8	1.0	.00			
	Public	106,148	2.7	1.0	.00	.07	***	.08
Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	Private	75,223	3.1	.9	.00			
	Public	106,014	3.0	.9	.00	.08	***	.09
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	Private	74,898	3.1	.9	.00			
	Public	105,509	3.0	.9	.00	.02	***	.02
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	Private	74,848	2.5	1.0	.00			
	Public	105,397	2.4	1.0	.00	.06	***	.06
Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	Private	74,708	3.0	.9	.00			
	Public	105,222	2.9	.9	.00	.07	***	.08
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	Private	74,543	2.7	.9	.00			
	Public	104,973	2.6	1.0	.00	.14	***	.15
Perceived Gains								
Private	74,595	35.9	13.4	.05				
Public	104,926	34.5	13.9	.04		1.38	***	.10
Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	Private	74,890	2.9	.9	.00			
	Public	105,380	2.8	.9	.00	.11	***	.12
Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	Private	74,638	2.7	.9	.00			
	Public	105,051	2.7	.9	.00	.07	***	.07
Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	Private	74,631	3.2	.8	.00			
	Public	105,020	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	Private	74,578	2.5	1.0	.00			
	Public	104,983	2.6	1.0	.00	-.11	***	-.11
Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Private	74,653	2.7	1.0	.00			
	Public	105,034	2.6	1.0	.00	.09	***	.09
Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Private	74,485	2.9	.9	.00			
	Public	104,837	2.8	.9	.00	.06	***	.07
Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Private	74,557	2.9	.9	.00			
	Public	104,858	2.7	1.0	.00	.19	***	.20
Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Private	74,607	2.8	1.0	.00			
	Public	104,981	2.7	1.0	.00	.07	***	.07
Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Private	74,485	2.7	.9	.00			
	Public	104,826	2.6	.9	.00	.05	***	.05
Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Private	74,210	2.7	1.0	.00			
	Public	104,437	2.6	1.0	.00	.08	***	.09
Overall Satisfaction								
Private	75,171	46.1	13.7	.05				
Public	105,867	44.6	13.3	.04		1.51	***	.11
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Private	74,862	3.3	.7	.00			
	Public	105,493	3.2	.7	.00	.12	***	.17
If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Private	74,953	3.3	.8	.00			
	Public	105,515	3.2	.8	.00	.03	***	.04

First-Year Students

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Additional Items								
Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	Private	75,136	15.5	8.4	.03	1.36	***	.16
	Public	105,860	14.1	8.3	.03			
Estimated hours: reading recoded by NSSE using tmprphrs and reading	Private	43,939	8.3	6.4	.03	1.72	***	.29
	Public	66,584	6.6	5.8	.02			
Estimated pages of assigned writing, recoded and summed by NSSE from wrshort, wrmed, and wrlong using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options	Private	73,830	54.1	54.4	.20	10.65	***	.19
	Public	105,707	43.4	55.0	.17			
To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	Private	80,157	5.6	1.1	.00	.09	***	.08
	Public	114,685	5.5	1.1	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Private	75,604	3.3	.7	.00	.06	***	.08
	Public	106,521	3.2	.7	.00			

Notes: SD=Standard Deviation; SEM=Standard Error of the Mean; MD=Mean Difference; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ES = Cohen's d effect size (mean difference/pooled SD)

Appendix E: Statistical Comparisons by Institutional Control—Seniors

Seniors

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Higher-Order Learning	Private	101,699	42.3	13.4	.04	1.48	***	.11
	Public	185,522	40.9	14.1	.03			
Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Private	104,274	3.2	.8	.00	.03	***	.04
	Public	190,223	3.2	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Private	104,115	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.08
	Public	189,712	3.1	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Private	104,101	3.1	.8	.00	.12	***	.13
	Public	189,740	3.0	.9	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Private	103,848	3.1	.8	.00	.09	***	.10
	Public	189,261	3.0	.9	.00			
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Private	105,546	40.3	12.5	.04	1.80	***	.14
	Public	192,736	38.5	13.0	.03			
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Private	106,789	3.0	.8	.00	.00		.00
	Public	195,561	3.0	.8	.00			
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Private	105,698	3.0	.9	.00	.11	***	.13
	Public	193,230	2.8	.9	.00			
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Private	105,785	2.8	.9	.00	.20	***	.21
	Public	193,412	2.6	1.0	.00			
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Private	105,646	3.0	.8	.00	.11	***	.13
	Public	193,119	2.8	.9	.00			
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Private	105,461	3.0	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Public	192,677	2.9	.8	.00			
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Private	105,192	3.0	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Public	192,035	3.0	.8	.00			
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Private	104,702	3.3	.7	.00	.06	***	.08
	Public	191,145	3.2	.7	.00			
Quantitative Reasoning	Private	103,816	29.3	17.4	.05	-.41	***	-.02
	Public	188,834	29.7	17.3	.04			
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Private	104,743	2.6	1.0	.00	-.05	***	-.05
	Public	190,692	2.6	1.0	.00			
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Private	104,534	2.4	1.0	.00	-.01	**	-.01
	Public	190,308	2.4	1.0	.00			
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Private	104,290	2.4	1.0	.00	.00		.00
	Public	189,725	2.4	1.0	.00			
Learning Strategies	Private	97,940	40.4	14.5	.05	.33	***	.02
	Public	175,385	40.1	14.8	.04			
Identified key information from reading assignments	Private	99,755	3.3	.7	.00	.08	***	.11
	Public	178,796	3.2	.8	.00			
Reviewed your notes after class	Private	99,467	2.9	1.0	.00	-.05	***	-.05
	Public	178,270	2.9	.9	.00			
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Private	98,466	2.9	.9	.00	.01	**	.01
	Public	176,457	2.9	.9	.00			
Collaborative Learning	Private	106,219	32.6	14.7	.05	-.62	***	-.04
	Public	195,001	33.2	14.4	.03			
Asked another student to help you understand course material	Private	110,305	2.4	.9	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Public	203,103	2.5	.9	.00			
Explained course material to one or more students	Private	108,335	2.7	.9	.00	-.04	***	-.05
	Public	199,215	2.8	.8	.00			
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Private	108,481	2.5	1.0	.00	.00		.00
	Public	199,327	2.5	1.0	.00			

Seniors

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Private	108,209	2.9	.9	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Public	198,804	2.9	.9	.00			
Discussions with Diverse Others	Private	98,815	40.9	15.4	.05	-.97	***	-.06
	Public	177,091	41.9	16.1	.04			
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	Private	100,155	3.1	.9	.00	-.01	**	-.01
	Public	179,718	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	Private	99,899	3.1	.9	.00	.02	***	.02
	Public	179,258	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	Private	99,687	2.9	1.0	.00	-.14	***	-.15
	Public	178,724	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	Private	99,358	3.0	.9	.00	-.06	***	-.07
	Public	178,043	3.1	.9	.00			
Student-Faculty Interaction	Private	103,550	26.2	16.4	.05	2.13	***	.13
	Public	188,791	24.1	16.3	.04			
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	Private	105,194	2.6	1.0	.00	.13	***	.13
	Public	191,808	2.4	1.0	.00			
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Private	104,821	2.1	1.0	.00	.11	***	.11
	Public	191,093	2.0	1.0	.00			
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	Private	104,711	2.3	1.0	.00	.12	***	.12
	Public	190,971	2.2	1.0	.00			
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	Private	104,447	2.3	.9	.00	.07	***	.07
	Public	190,386	2.2	.9	.00			
Effective Teaching Practices	Private	104,773	42.3	13.1	.04	1.75	***	.13
	Public	190,758	40.6	13.7	.03			
Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	Private	104,892	3.3	.7	.00	.06	***	.07
	Public	191,034	3.2	.8	.00			
Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	Private	104,602	3.2	.7	.00	.08	***	.10
	Public	190,493	3.1	.8	.00			
Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	Private	104,375	3.2	.8	.00	.06	***	.07
	Public	190,061	3.2	.8	.00			
Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Private	104,340	2.9	.9	.00	.12	***	.13
	Public	189,986	2.8	1.0	.00			
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Private	103,923	3.0	.9	.00	.13	***	.14
	Public	189,267	2.9	.9	.00			
Quality of Interactions	Private	96,021	44.1	11.2	.04	2.17	***	.19
	Public	169,979	41.9	11.8	.03			
Quality of interactions with students	Private	99,490	5.8	1.3	.00	.11	***	.09
	Public	178,144	5.7	1.3	.00			
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Private	99,319	5.5	1.7	.01	.32	***	.18
	Public	177,815	5.2	1.8	.00			
Quality of interactions with faculty	Private	98,682	5.8	1.3	.00	.27	***	.20
	Public	176,778	5.5	1.4	.00			
Quality of interactions with student services staff	Private	98,978	5.5	2.1	.01	-.03	**	-.01
	Public	177,140	5.6	2.2	.01			
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Private	99,107	5.1	1.8	.01	.15	***	.08
	Public	177,435	5.0	1.9	.01			
Supportive Environment	Private	94,759	35.4	13.9	.05	2.12	***	.15
	Public	166,990	33.3	14.2	.04			
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	Private	94,977	3.1	.8	.00	.15	***	.18
	Public	167,397	3.0	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	Private	95,051	3.0	.9	.00	.12	***	.13
	Public	167,535	2.9	.9	.00			

Seniors

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	Private	95,244	2.7	1.0	.00	.10	***	.10
	Public	167,860	2.6	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	Private	95,161	3.0	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
	Public	167,739	2.9	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	Private	94,777	2.9	.9	.00	.03	***	.04
	Public	166,977	2.8	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	Private	94,738	2.2	1.0	.00	.13	***	.13
	Public	166,878	2.1	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	Private	94,498	2.8	1.0	.00	.08	***	.09
	Public	166,488	2.7	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	Private	94,321	2.6	1.0	.00	.14	***	.14
	Public	166,170	2.5	1.0	.00			
Perceived Gains	Private	94,514	40.3	13.1	.04	2.15	***	.16
	Public	166,437	38.1	14.0	.03			
Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	Private	94,848	3.2	.9	.00	.17	***	.19
	Public	166,981	3.0	.9	.00			
Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	Private	94,513	3.1	.9	.00	.14	***	.16
	Public	166,450	2.9	.9	.00			
Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	Private	94,468	3.4	.7	.00	.12	***	.15
	Public	166,330	3.3	.8	.00			
Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	Private	94,468	2.8	1.0	.00	-.07	***	-.07
	Public	166,302	2.8	1.0	.00			
Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Private	94,622	3.0	.9	.00	.07	***	.08
	Public	166,611	3.0	1.0	.00			
Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Private	94,341	3.1	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
	Public	166,176	3.0	.9	.00			
Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Private	94,458	3.0	.9	.00	.27	***	.27
	Public	166,396	2.8	1.0	.00			
Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Private	94,532	2.9	1.0	.00	.08	***	.09
	Public	166,430	2.8	1.0	.00			
Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Private	94,447	2.9	.9	.00	.07	***	.08
	Public	166,329	2.8	1.0	.00			
Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Private	94,010	2.8	1.0	.00	.13	***	.13
	Public	165,555	2.7	1.0	.00			
Overall Satisfaction	Private	95,172	47.0	14.1	.05	2.21	***	.15
	Public	167,701	44.7	14.3	.04			
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Private	94,810	3.4	.7	.00	.16	***	.23
	Public	167,082	3.3	.7	.00			
If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Private	94,921	3.3	.8	.00	.06	***	.07
	Public	167,260	3.2	.8	.00			
Additional Items								
Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	Private	95,016	15.4	8.8	.03	.61	***	.07
	Public	167,455	14.8	8.9	.02			
Estimated hours: reading recoded by NSSE using tmprphrs and reading	Private	53,183	8.3	6.6	.03	1.07	***	.17
	Public	103,105	7.3	6.4	.02			
Estimated pages of assigned writing, recoded and summed by NSSE from wrshort, wrmed, and wrlong using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options	Private	91,358	86.3	80.5	.27	13.53	***	.17
	Public	162,411	72.8	80.0	.20			
To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	Private	99,467	5.7	1.1	.00	.08	***	.07
	Public	178,068	5.7	1.2	.00			

Seniors

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.	ES
Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	Private	95,626	3.3	.7	.00	.07	***	.10
	Public	168,511	3.2	.8	.00			

Notes: SD=Standard Deviation; SEM=Standard Error of the Mean; MD=Mean Difference; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; ES = Cohen's d effect size (mean difference/pooled SD)

Appendix F: Frequencies by Carnegie/Control Groups—First-Year Students

First-Year Students		Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
Variables	Response labels	BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
Higher-Order Learning	Lowest Third	37.8%	42.5%	37.8%	43.1%	40.7%	
	Middle Third	31.7%	30.3%	31.6%	30.1%	30.8%	
	Highest Third	30.6%	27.1%	30.6%	26.9%	28.5%	
HOapply Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Very little	2.9%	3.7%	2.8%	3.3%	3.3%	
	Some	21.8%	24.6%	19.7%	22.0%	22.6%	
	Quite a bit	45.7%	44.4%	45.4%	43.9%	44.8%	
	Very much	29.6%	27.3%	32.0%	30.7%	29.4%	
HOanalyze Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Very little	2.9%	4.3%	3.0%	4.0%	3.6%	
	Some	21.3%	25.0%	20.4%	24.1%	23.2%	
	Quite a bit	43.3%	42.3%	43.5%	42.4%	42.7%	
	Very much	32.5%	28.4%	33.2%	29.6%	30.5%	
HOevaluate Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Very little	3.0%	4.2%	3.8%	5.2%	4.1%	
	Some	23.0%	25.9%	23.6%	27.6%	25.3%	
	Quite a bit	44.4%	43.5%	43.7%	42.0%	43.4%	
	Very much	29.5%	26.4%	29.0%	25.2%	27.3%	
HOform Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Very little	3.6%	5.0%	4.3%	5.5%	4.6%	
	Some	24.2%	26.6%	25.0%	27.6%	26.0%	
	Quite a bit	43.5%	42.4%	42.8%	41.3%	42.5%	
	Very much	28.7%	25.9%	27.8%	25.6%	26.9%	
Reflective & Integrative Learning		Lowest Third	22.9%	27.8%	23.0%	28.2%	25.9%
		Middle Third	44.7%	43.9%	45.4%	43.8%	44.2%
		Highest Third	32.4%	28.3%	31.6%	28.0%	29.8%
Rlntegrate Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Never	5.7%	7.2%	5.0%	6.2%	6.2%	
	Sometimes	37.6%	37.8%	37.3%	38.3%	37.8%	
	Often	37.3%	36.5%	38.0%	36.4%	36.8%	
	Very often	19.5%	18.5%	19.7%	19.1%	19.1%	
Rlsocietal Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Never	6.5%	9.0%	6.3%	9.0%	8.0%	
	Sometimes	37.3%	39.4%	37.5%	40.0%	38.7%	
	Often	36.8%	34.6%	37.0%	34.4%	35.5%	
	Very often	19.4%	16.9%	19.2%	16.6%	17.8%	
Rldiverse Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Never	6.7%	10.6%	7.1%	11.1%	9.2%	
	Sometimes	37.5%	40.3%	38.5%	41.1%	39.4%	
	Often	36.3%	32.8%	35.8%	32.1%	34.0%	
	Very often	19.6%	16.3%	18.7%	15.7%	17.4%	
Rlownview Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Never	3.9%	5.2%	4.3%	5.4%	4.8%	
	Sometimes	31.2%	33.8%	31.8%	34.1%	32.9%	
	Often	43.3%	41.6%	43.7%	41.2%	42.2%	
	Very often	21.6%	19.4%	20.2%	19.2%	20.1%	
Rlperspect Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Never	2.9%	3.9%	3.1%	4.0%	3.5%	
	Sometimes	28.9%	30.4%	29.5%	31.2%	30.1%	
	Often	43.4%	41.9%	43.5%	41.4%	42.4%	
	Very often	24.8%	23.9%	23.9%	23.4%	24.0%	
Rlnewview Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Never	2.3%	3.1%	2.1%	3.2%	2.8%	
	Sometimes	29.3%	32.2%	29.1%	32.8%	31.2%	
	Often	43.1%	42.0%	43.8%	41.6%	42.4%	
	Very often	25.3%	22.7%	25.0%	22.4%	23.7%	
Rlconnect Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Never	1.1%	1.8%	1.0%	1.5%	1.4%	
	Sometimes	18.8%	22.3%	18.3%	22.0%	20.7%	
	Often	45.4%	44.6%	46.5%	44.9%	45.1%	
	Very often	34.7%	31.4%	34.2%	31.6%	32.7%	

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Quantitative Reasoning	Lowest Third	47.7%	47.6%	46.2%	44.4%	46.6%
	Middle Third	13.0%	13.0%	13.4%	13.2%	13.1%
	Highest Third	39.3%	39.4%	40.5%	42.3%	40.3%
QRconclude Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Never	14.9%	14.1%	15.2%	12.6%	14.0%
	Sometimes	36.1%	36.2%	34.5%	34.7%	35.6%
	Often	32.8%	33.1%	33.8%	34.3%	33.4%
	Very often	16.1%	16.5%	16.5%	18.4%	16.9%
QRproblem Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Never	22.7%	22.8%	23.5%	21.8%	22.5%
	Sometimes	41.1%	40.3%	39.8%	39.8%	40.4%
	Often	25.2%	25.2%	25.7%	26.3%	25.6%
	Very often	11.0%	11.7%	11.0%	12.1%	11.5%
QRevaluate Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Never	22.0%	23.1%	20.7%	20.2%	21.7%
	Sometimes	41.8%	41.4%	41.2%	41.4%	41.5%
	Often	26.0%	25.2%	27.8%	27.2%	26.3%
	Very often	10.2%	10.4%	10.2%	11.1%	10.5%
Learning Strategies	Lowest Third	25.0%	27.2%	26.5%	28.3%	26.7%
	Middle Third	47.1%	46.3%	46.6%	46.2%	46.6%
	Highest Third	27.9%	26.6%	26.9%	25.4%	26.7%
LSreading Identified key information from reading assignments	Never	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%	1.7%	1.4%
	Sometimes	14.8%	18.7%	15.1%	19.0%	17.2%
	Often	42.7%	43.9%	42.0%	43.5%	43.2%
	Very often	41.5%	35.8%	41.9%	35.9%	38.2%
LSnotes Reviewed your notes after class	Never	4.8%	4.6%	5.2%	4.9%	4.8%
	Sometimes	29.8%	28.6%	31.3%	30.7%	29.8%
	Often	33.1%	33.9%	33.0%	33.2%	33.4%
	Very often	32.3%	32.9%	30.5%	31.2%	32.0%
LSsummary Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Never	5.8%	6.6%	6.2%	6.7%	6.3%
	Sometimes	30.0%	30.7%	30.9%	31.4%	30.7%
	Often	36.0%	35.6%	35.5%	35.4%	35.7%
	Very often	28.2%	27.2%	27.4%	26.5%	27.3%
Collaborative Learning	Lowest Third	36.0%	40.6%	37.2%	37.9%	38.1%
	Middle Third	39.7%	38.0%	38.9%	38.2%	38.7%
	Highest Third	24.3%	21.4%	23.9%	23.9%	23.3%
CLaskhelp Asked another student to help you understand course material	Never	7.3%	8.4%	6.9%	7.4%	7.6%
	Sometimes	40.1%	41.5%	40.9%	39.2%	40.3%
	Often	35.0%	33.1%	34.3%	34.5%	34.2%
	Very often	17.7%	17.0%	17.8%	18.9%	17.8%
Clexplain Explained course material to one or more students	Never	4.0%	4.3%	3.1%	3.6%	3.9%
	Sometimes	37.2%	39.4%	37.8%	37.0%	37.8%
	Often	39.7%	38.0%	40.0%	39.5%	39.1%
	Very often	19.2%	18.4%	19.1%	19.9%	19.1%
CLstudy Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Never	11.7%	14.7%	10.8%	12.7%	12.8%
	Sometimes	35.2%	37.5%	35.5%	35.7%	36.1%
	Often	31.9%	29.6%	31.7%	30.7%	30.8%
	Very often	21.3%	18.2%	22.0%	20.9%	20.3%
CLproject Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Never	5.9%	7.7%	6.2%	7.5%	6.9%
	Sometimes	38.1%	40.6%	41.0%	40.5%	39.8%
	Often	36.8%	34.8%	35.0%	34.2%	35.3%
	Very often	19.2%	16.9%	17.8%	17.9%	18.0%

First-Year Students		Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
Variables	Response labels	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Discussions with Diverse Others	Lowest Third	37.0%	38.6%	35.9%	34.9%	36.8%
	Middle Third	33.9%	31.8%	32.8%	32.5%	32.8%
	Highest Third	29.0%	29.6%	31.2%	32.6%	30.4%
DDrace Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	Never	3.9%	5.4%	3.7%	4.4%	4.5%
	Sometimes	23.4%	25.4%	21.6%	23.1%	23.8%
	Often	29.2%	29.5%	28.0%	29.7%	29.3%
	Very often	43.5%	39.8%	46.7%	42.8%	42.4%
DDeconomic Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	Never	3.4%	5.1%	3.0%	4.0%	4.1%
	Sometimes	20.7%	23.1%	20.6%	21.9%	21.8%
	Often	33.8%	34.2%	32.6%	33.9%	33.9%
	Very often	42.1%	37.6%	43.8%	40.1%	40.3%
DDreligion Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	Never	6.3%	6.5%	7.6%	5.2%	6.2%
	Sometimes	26.6%	24.8%	25.5%	23.0%	25.0%
	Often	29.1%	30.6%	26.9%	30.5%	29.8%
	Very often	38.0%	38.0%	40.1%	41.2%	39.1%
DDpolitical Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	Never	5.8%	7.1%	5.3%	5.6%	6.1%
	Sometimes	26.8%	25.3%	26.9%	23.4%	25.4%
	Often	31.1%	31.6%	30.2%	31.4%	31.3%
	Very often	36.3%	35.9%	37.6%	39.6%	37.2%
Student-Faculty Interaction		Lowest Third	41.2%	49.4%	50.7%	47.0%
		Middle Third	27.9%	24.4%	26.3%	24.8%
		Highest Third	30.9%	26.5%	24.3%	27.2%
SFcareer Talked about career plans with a faculty member	Never	17.4%	21.8%	23.3%	22.4%	20.7%
	Sometimes	46.8%	45.2%	47.1%	46.5%	46.3%
	Often	24.0%	21.6%	20.7%	20.9%	22.1%
	Very often	11.8%	11.4%	8.9%	10.2%	11.0%
SFotherwork Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Never	45.7%	53.3%	52.8%	52.9%	50.7%
	Sometimes	33.7%	28.3%	30.7%	29.2%	30.5%
	Often	13.7%	11.9%	11.2%	12.0%	12.4%
	Very often	6.9%	6.5%	5.2%	5.9%	6.4%
SFdiscuss Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	Never	25.0%	33.5%	28.6%	34.1%	30.5%
	Sometimes	45.4%	41.6%	47.2%	43.0%	43.7%
	Often	20.7%	17.2%	17.5%	16.2%	18.1%
	Very often	8.8%	7.7%	6.7%	6.7%	7.7%
SFperform Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	Never	19.5%	25.4%	24.9%	27.0%	23.9%
	Sometimes	48.1%	45.7%	49.2%	47.3%	47.2%
	Often	22.8%	19.9%	18.8%	18.1%	20.2%
	Very often	9.7%	9.1%	7.2%	7.6%	8.7%
Effective Teaching Practices		Lowest Third	36.0%	41.6%	41.8%	45.2%
		Middle Third	34.6%	32.3%	33.7%	32.6%
		Highest Third	29.4%	26.1%	24.6%	22.2%
ETgoals Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	Very little	1.4%	2.0%	1.5%	1.9%	1.7%
	Some	15.0%	17.4%	16.8%	17.4%	16.5%
	Quite a bit	45.4%	44.1%	46.8%	45.9%	45.3%
	Very much	38.2%	36.5%	35.0%	34.8%	36.5%
ETorganize Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	Very little	1.9%	2.7%	1.8%	2.3%	2.2%
	Some	15.6%	18.9%	16.9%	18.5%	17.6%
	Quite a bit	46.3%	45.4%	47.4%	47.0%	46.3%
	Very much	36.2%	33.0%	33.9%	32.2%	33.9%
ETexample Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	Very little	2.4%	3.2%	2.3%	2.9%	2.8%
	Some	17.5%	20.0%	18.5%	20.2%	19.1%
	Quite a bit	41.4%	41.1%	42.4%	42.2%	41.6%
	Very much	38.7%	35.7%	36.9%	34.7%	36.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
ETdraftfb Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Very little	5.6%	7.0%	7.3%	9.6%	7.3%	
	Some	24.2%	27.1%	28.1%	30.7%	27.3%	
	Quite a bit	37.2%	36.0%	37.6%	34.9%	36.2%	
	Very much	33.0%	29.8%	27.0%	24.8%	29.2%	
ETfeedback Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Very little	5.4%	8.2%	7.2%	10.2%	7.8%	
	Some	25.9%	29.1%	30.9%	32.7%	29.3%	
	Quite a bit	39.9%	36.9%	38.9%	36.2%	37.8%	
	Very much	28.8%	25.7%	23.1%	20.9%	25.1%	
Quality of Interactions		Lowest Third	29.7%	38.6%	34.7%	38.9%	35.4%
		Middle Third	33.8%	31.9%	34.7%	33.5%	33.2%
		Highest Third	36.6%	29.5%	30.6%	27.6%	31.4%
Q1studentR Quality of interactions with students	Poor	1.2%	1.7%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	
	2	1.6%	2.3%	1.6%	2.0%	1.9%	
	3	3.5%	4.7%	3.8%	4.4%	4.2%	
	4	8.1%	10.6%	8.4%	9.8%	9.4%	
	5	20.5%	23.4%	21.6%	22.9%	22.2%	
	6	31.0%	28.5%	31.9%	30.4%	30.2%	
	Excellent	33.6%	28.1%	31.2%	28.7%	30.3%	
	Not applicable	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	
Q1advisorR Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Poor	3.0%	4.9%	3.8%	3.8%	3.9%	
	2	4.4%	5.9%	5.0%	5.7%	5.3%	
	3	7.3%	8.6%	8.2%	8.7%	8.2%	
	4	12.6%	13.6%	13.6%	14.3%	13.5%	
	5	19.6%	18.8%	20.5%	20.2%	19.6%	
	6	22.9%	21.0%	22.0%	21.4%	21.8%	
	Excellent	28.8%	24.3%	23.8%	23.7%	25.6%	
	Not applicable	1.3%	2.9%	3.1%	2.2%	2.2%	
Q1facultyR Quality of interactions with faculty	Poor	1.2%	2.3%	1.4%	2.2%	1.8%	
	2	2.1%	3.7%	2.4%	3.8%	3.1%	
	3	4.5%	7.0%	5.9%	7.4%	6.2%	
	4	10.7%	14.1%	13.2%	15.0%	13.2%	
	5	22.7%	24.4%	25.4%	26.1%	24.4%	
	6	31.8%	27.5%	30.3%	27.2%	29.0%	
	Excellent	26.5%	20.1%	20.7%	17.3%	21.5%	
	Not applicable	0.6%	0.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.8%	
Q1staffR Quality of interactions with student services staff	Poor	3.5%	5.4%	3.7%	4.5%	4.4%	
	2	4.3%	5.1%	4.3%	4.9%	4.7%	
	3	6.8%	7.9%	7.3%	7.7%	7.4%	
	4	12.8%	13.7%	14.7%	14.4%	13.7%	
	5	20.8%	20.1%	22.8%	21.6%	20.9%	
	6	23.4%	20.9%	23.2%	21.7%	22.1%	
	Excellent	20.9%	17.6%	16.8%	16.3%	18.3%	
	Not applicable	7.5%	9.4%	7.2%	8.9%	8.5%	
Q1adminR Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Poor	3.6%	5.7%	4.7%	5.4%	4.8%	
	2	5.0%	6.4%	5.5%	6.4%	5.9%	
	3	7.5%	8.9%	8.3%	9.0%	8.4%	
	4	13.6%	14.9%	15.1%	16.0%	14.8%	
	5	21.3%	20.4%	21.6%	21.0%	20.9%	
	6	23.4%	20.6%	20.7%	19.5%	21.2%	
	Excellent	21.3%	17.0%	15.2%	14.2%	17.5%	
	Not applicable	4.3%	6.1%	8.9%	8.6%	6.4%	
Supportive Environment		Lowest Third	33.3%	39.6%	35.6%	37.5%	36.6%
		Middle Third	35.3%	33.6%	35.6%	35.1%	34.8%
		Highest Third	31.4%	26.9%	28.8%	27.4%	28.7%

First-Year Students		Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
Variables	Response labels	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
SEacademic Institutional emphasis:	Very little	2.5%	3.7%	2.7%	3.2%	3.1%	
Providing support to help students succeed academically	Some	15.4%	18.7%	17.7%	18.6%	17.5%	
	Quite a bit	39.0%	40.1%	41.7%	41.3%	40.2%	
	Very much	43.1%	37.4%	38.0%	36.9%	39.2%	
SElearnup Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	Very little	4.4%	5.4%	4.2%	5.0%	4.9%	
	Some	15.0%	16.2%	17.6%	16.7%	16.1%	
	Quite a bit	34.7%	35.4%	37.1%	37.1%	35.8%	
	Very much	45.9%	43.0%	41.2%	41.2%	43.3%	
SEdiverse Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	Very little	9.9%	12.1%	11.1%	11.2%	11.0%	
	Some	28.0%	29.6%	29.0%	29.6%	29.0%	
	Quite a bit	33.2%	32.3%	32.2%	33.3%	32.9%	
	Very much	29.0%	26.0%	27.7%	25.9%	27.1%	
SEsocial Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	Very little	4.3%	5.9%	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%	
	Some	18.8%	22.4%	19.1%	20.4%	20.4%	
	Quite a bit	37.8%	37.8%	38.4%	38.9%	38.2%	
	Very much	39.1%	33.9%	37.9%	36.2%	36.6%	
SEwellness Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	Very little	5.3%	6.2%	5.4%	5.1%	5.5%	
	Some	19.9%	21.6%	20.6%	19.7%	20.4%	
	Quite a bit	38.6%	38.0%	38.7%	38.7%	38.5%	
	Very much	36.2%	34.2%	35.3%	36.5%	35.6%	
SEnonacad Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	Very little	17.5%	20.8%	18.1%	19.6%	19.2%	
	Some	35.3%	34.5%	36.8%	36.3%	35.5%	
	Quite a bit	29.9%	28.1%	28.6%	28.1%	28.7%	
	Very much	17.3%	16.7%	16.4%	15.9%	16.6%	
SEactivities Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	Very little	6.5%	8.0%	6.2%	5.8%	6.7%	
	Some	20.7%	24.8%	22.1%	23.0%	22.7%	
	Quite a bit	37.9%	37.1%	38.9%	38.7%	38.0%	
	Very much	34.8%	30.1%	32.8%	32.5%	32.6%	
SEevents Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	Very little	10.8%	14.5%	10.4%	12.9%	12.5%	
	Some	29.3%	32.8%	31.3%	33.9%	31.8%	
	Quite a bit	34.9%	32.0%	35.2%	33.1%	33.5%	
	Very much	25.0%	20.7%	23.1%	20.0%	22.1%	
Perceived Gains in Learning and Development		Lowest Third	30.3%	34.6%	32.4%	35.9%	33.3%
		Middle Third	36.6%	35.3%	37.1%	35.8%	36.0%
		Highest Third	33.1%	30.1%	30.5%	28.3%	30.6%
PGwrite Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively		Very little	5.5%	6.8%	7.2%	9.7%	7.2%
		Some	23.3%	24.9%	24.5%	27.6%	25.1%
		Quite a bit	41.3%	40.9%	40.7%	38.6%	40.3%
		Very much	29.9%	27.5%	27.6%	24.1%	27.3%
PGspeak Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively		Very little	9.2%	10.4%	12.4%	14.1%	11.2%
		Some	29.6%	29.0%	31.1%	32.4%	30.3%
		Quite a bit	38.0%	37.8%	36.2%	34.3%	36.7%
		Very much	23.2%	22.8%	20.2%	19.2%	21.7%
PGthink Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically		Very little	2.7%	3.4%	3.1%	3.6%	3.2%
		Some	16.5%	19.7%	17.8%	19.7%	18.5%
		Quite a bit	42.4%	43.0%	42.9%	42.8%	42.7%
		Very much	38.3%	33.9%	36.2%	33.9%	35.5%
PGanalyze Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information		Very little	16.8%	13.7%	16.8%	12.6%	14.7%
		Some	32.9%	32.1%	30.7%	30.2%	31.7%
		Quite a bit	31.3%	34.0%	32.0%	34.9%	33.2%
		Very much	19.0%	20.3%	20.6%	22.4%	20.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
PGwork Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Very little	11.5%	15.0%	12.9%	14.0%	13.4%
	Some	30.5%	31.8%	30.9%	31.5%	31.2%
	Quite a bit	34.5%	32.5%	33.8%	33.4%	33.5%
	Very much	23.5%	20.7%	22.4%	21.1%	21.9%
PGothers Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Very little	5.8%	7.1%	7.1%	7.4%	6.8%
	Some	25.5%	27.0%	28.4%	28.4%	27.0%
	Quite a bit	40.4%	39.3%	39.5%	39.3%	39.7%
	Very much	28.3%	26.6%	25.0%	24.9%	26.6%
PGvalues Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Very little	8.8%	12.8%	10.8%	14.4%	11.8%
	Some	25.7%	29.1%	25.8%	29.9%	27.9%
	Quite a bit	36.1%	34.0%	34.6%	33.8%	34.7%
	Very much	29.5%	24.0%	28.9%	21.9%	25.6%
PGdiverse Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Very little	9.8%	11.5%	10.7%	11.5%	10.8%
	Some	27.9%	29.0%	29.1%	29.7%	28.9%
	Quite a bit	34.8%	34.3%	34.9%	34.5%	34.6%
	Very much	27.5%	25.2%	25.4%	24.3%	25.7%
PGprobsolve Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Very little	11.3%	13.2%	12.2%	12.8%	12.4%
	Some	32.8%	33.4%	32.8%	33.1%	33.1%
	Quite a bit	34.6%	33.5%	34.8%	34.2%	34.2%
	Very much	21.3%	19.9%	20.3%	20.0%	20.4%
PGcitizen Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Very little	11.2%	13.2%	12.3%	13.2%	12.5%
	Some	30.5%	32.2%	30.9%	32.9%	31.7%
	Quite a bit	34.7%	33.6%	34.9%	33.8%	34.1%
	Very much	23.6%	21.0%	21.9%	20.1%	21.7%
Satisfaction with the Institutional Experience	Lowest Third	44.2%	52.9%	44.4%	46.9%	47.6%
	Middle Third	21.1%	22.2%	20.6%	23.0%	21.9%
	Highest Third	34.7%	24.9%	34.9%	30.1%	30.5%
evalexpl How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Poor	1.3%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
	Fair	9.4%	12.3%	9.6%	10.5%	10.6%
	Good	44.0%	52.6%	44.1%	49.4%	48.1%
	Excellent	45.3%	33.5%	44.9%	38.6%	39.8%
sameinst If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Definitely no	3.8%	3.8%	3.0%	2.9%	3.5%
	Probably no	11.7%	13.0%	11.4%	10.8%	11.8%
	Probably yes	38.1%	43.0%	38.5%	40.2%	40.2%
	Definitely yes	46.5%	40.2%	47.1%	46.1%	44.5%
Additional Items						
tmprephrs Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	0 hrs	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
	1-5 hrs	11.2%	16.6%	8.9%	12.4%	13.0%
	6-10 hrs	21.9%	25.8%	19.1%	22.9%	23.1%
	11-15 hrs	21.4%	21.6%	21.9%	21.7%	21.6%
	16-20 hrs	19.1%	16.3%	20.1%	18.1%	18.1%
	21-25 hrs	12.6%	9.7%	14.0%	11.7%	11.6%
	26-30 hrs	7.3%	5.0%	7.7%	6.4%	6.4%
reading Of the time you spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how many hours are on ASSIGNED READING?	> 30 hrs	6.3%	4.5%	7.9%	6.3%	5.9%
	Very little	6.1%	9.9%	6.1%	13.7%	9.4%
	Some	25.0%	30.0%	25.6%	34.5%	29.2%
	About half	31.6%	30.6%	29.5%	27.8%	30.1%
	Most	27.0%	21.8%	28.0%	17.5%	22.8%
	Almost all	10.3%	7.7%	10.9%	6.6%	8.5%

First-Year Students

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
wrshort Number of written papers or reports: Up to 5 pages	None	2.4%	4.8%	2.2%	5.3%	3.9%
	1-2	14.1%	20.6%	13.9%	20.9%	18.0%
	3-5	28.4%	32.4%	29.0%	32.7%	30.9%
	6-10	27.7%	24.8%	27.7%	23.8%	25.7%
	11-15	13.8%	9.6%	13.2%	9.2%	11.2%
	16-20	6.7%	3.9%	6.7%	4.0%	5.1%
wrmed Number of written papers or reports: Between 6 and 10 pages	> 20 papers	6.9%	3.9%	7.3%	4.0%	5.2%
	None	24.5%	36.4%	20.2%	34.3%	30.5%
	1-2	45.0%	41.9%	43.6%	41.7%	43.0%
	3-5	22.1%	15.4%	25.6%	16.7%	18.8%
	6-10	6.5%	4.7%	8.1%	5.3%	5.7%
	11-15	1.3%	1.0%	1.7%	1.2%	1.2%
wrlong Number of written papers or reports: 11 pages or more	16-20	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
	> 20 papers	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
	None	71.7%	79.3%	68.8%	77.4%	75.4%
	1-2	22.5%	15.4%	24.5%	16.6%	18.8%
	3-5	3.2%	2.5%	3.7%	2.9%	3.0%
	6-10	1.1%	1.2%	1.4%	1.5%	1.3%
challenge To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	11-15	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%
	16-20	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
	> 20 papers	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
	1 Not at all	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
	2	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%
	3	2.5%	2.9%	2.5%	3.1%	2.8%
empstudy Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	4	8.4%	10.3%	8.8%	10.1%	9.5%
	5	30.7%	32.9%	30.2%	31.8%	31.6%
	6	34.7%	31.1%	35.4%	32.7%	33.1%
	7 Very Much	22.7%	21.4%	21.7%	20.9%	21.7%
	Very little	1.2%	1.6%	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%
	Some	12.7%	15.2%	12.7%	14.1%	13.9%

Appendix G: Frequencies by Carnegie/Control Groups—Seniors

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Higher-Order Learning	Lowest Third	30.8%	34.5%	35.1%	38.5%	34.7%
	Middle Third	40.6%	38.2%	40.1%	37.4%	38.8%
	Highest Third	28.7%	27.3%	24.8%	24.2%	26.5%
HOapply Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	Very little	2.2%	2.7%	2.3%	3.0%	2.6%
	Some	16.3%	17.2%	16.3%	17.8%	17.1%
	Quite a bit	43.2%	41.9%	43.6%	41.9%	42.4%
	Very much	38.3%	38.2%	37.8%	37.3%	37.9%
HOanalyze Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Very little	2.5%	3.4%	3.0%	4.0%	3.3%
	Some	17.0%	19.0%	18.4%	20.3%	18.8%
	Quite a bit	41.2%	40.1%	40.9%	39.6%	40.3%
	Very much	39.3%	37.6%	37.7%	36.1%	37.6%
HOevaluate Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Very little	3.1%	4.6%	5.2%	6.8%	4.9%
	Some	19.7%	22.7%	23.7%	25.9%	22.9%
	Quite a bit	42.1%	40.5%	40.5%	38.3%	40.3%
	Very much	35.1%	32.2%	30.6%	29.0%	31.9%
HOform Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Very little	3.1%	4.3%	4.4%	5.6%	4.4%
	Some	20.4%	22.5%	23.4%	25.0%	22.8%
	Quite a bit	42.4%	41.0%	41.8%	39.8%	41.1%
	Very much	34.2%	32.1%	30.4%	29.5%	31.8%
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Lowest Third	35.4%	40.1%	38.5%	43.7%	39.8%
	Middle Third	26.8%	25.7%	27.1%	25.3%	26.0%
	Highest Third	37.8%	34.2%	34.5%	31.0%	34.2%
Rlintegrate Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	Never	2.6%	2.9%	2.1%	2.8%	2.7%
	Sometimes	24.9%	24.1%	23.9%	24.9%	24.5%
	Often	39.5%	39.2%	40.7%	39.4%	39.5%
	Very often	33.0%	33.7%	33.4%	32.9%	33.2%
Rlsocietal Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Never	3.7%	5.7%	4.5%	7.0%	5.5%
	Sometimes	26.9%	29.4%	29.2%	31.7%	29.4%
	Often	37.9%	36.1%	37.4%	35.0%	36.3%
	Very often	31.5%	28.8%	28.9%	26.4%	28.8%
Rldiverse Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Never	5.4%	10.2%	8.3%	13.9%	9.9%
	Sometimes	31.0%	34.1%	34.2%	35.5%	33.7%
	Often	35.5%	31.6%	33.2%	29.1%	32.0%
	Very often	28.2%	24.1%	24.3%	21.5%	24.4%
Rlownview Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Never	2.9%	4.5%	3.8%	5.4%	4.3%
	Sometimes	26.1%	29.6%	29.9%	31.6%	29.3%
	Often	42.8%	40.5%	41.2%	39.4%	40.9%
	Very often	28.2%	25.3%	25.1%	23.6%	25.6%
Riperspect Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	Never	2.2%	3.3%	2.8%	4.0%	3.2%
	Sometimes	24.1%	26.2%	26.7%	28.1%	26.3%
	Often	43.1%	41.5%	42.3%	40.5%	41.7%
	Very often	30.6%	29.0%	28.2%	27.3%	28.8%
Rlnewview Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	Never	1.5%	2.2%	1.3%	2.3%	2.0%
	Sometimes	25.3%	27.6%	25.2%	29.2%	27.3%
	Often	42.4%	41.6%	43.6%	41.6%	42.0%
	Very often	30.8%	28.6%	29.8%	26.9%	28.8%
Rlconnect Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	Never	0.7%	1.1%	0.7%	1.2%	1.0%
	Sometimes	12.8%	14.6%	13.7%	16.1%	14.5%
	Often	41.6%	41.6%	42.2%	42.2%	41.8%
	Very often	44.9%	42.7%	43.4%	40.6%	42.7%

Seniors		Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
Variables	Response labels	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Quantitative Reasoning	Lowest Third	42.7%	41.9%	39.5%	39.9%	41.3%
	Middle Third	37.5%	38.0%	39.2%	39.1%	38.3%
	Highest Third	19.7%	20.1%	21.2%	21.0%	20.4%
QRconclude Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	Never	14.9%	13.7%	14.2%	12.9%	13.8%
	Sometimes	33.9%	33.3%	31.7%	31.7%	32.8%
	Often	31.0%	32.2%	31.9%	32.6%	32.0%
	Very often	20.2%	20.8%	22.2%	22.8%	21.4%
QRproblem Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	Never	19.4%	19.4%	19.5%	19.8%	19.5%
	Sometimes	37.6%	37.1%	36.0%	36.1%	36.8%
	Often	27.0%	27.0%	27.3%	26.9%	27.0%
	Very often	16.0%	16.6%	17.2%	17.2%	16.7%
QRevaluate Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	Never	18.4%	18.8%	16.5%	17.4%	18.1%
	Sometimes	38.2%	38.3%	36.6%	37.4%	37.8%
	Often	28.1%	27.5%	29.9%	29.0%	28.3%
	Very often	15.3%	15.4%	17.0%	16.3%	15.8%
Learning Strategies	Lowest Third	24.1%	25.0%	29.6%	27.9%	26.0%
	Middle Third	45.5%	44.3%	45.3%	44.0%	44.6%
	Highest Third	30.4%	30.7%	25.1%	28.1%	29.4%
LSreading Identified key information from reading assignments	Never	1.2%	1.9%	1.6%	2.2%	1.8%
	Sometimes	12.5%	14.8%	14.7%	16.6%	14.7%
	Often	37.5%	38.3%	38.7%	38.7%	38.2%
	Very often	48.7%	45.0%	45.0%	42.5%	45.3%
LSnotes Reviewed your notes after class	Never	7.5%	6.6%	9.0%	7.4%	7.3%
	Sometimes	29.7%	28.5%	34.8%	30.4%	29.9%
	Often	30.6%	31.0%	29.2%	30.7%	30.7%
	Very often	32.2%	33.9%	27.0%	31.5%	32.1%
LSsummary Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	Never	6.0%	6.6%	7.8%	7.4%	6.8%
	Sometimes	27.3%	27.2%	32.1%	29.3%	28.2%
	Often	35.1%	34.5%	33.4%	33.7%	34.4%
	Very often	31.6%	31.7%	26.7%	29.6%	30.7%
Collaborative Learning	Lowest Third	39.2%	37.6%	35.6%	37.3%	37.8%
	Middle Third	36.6%	37.2%	37.8%	36.8%	36.9%
	Highest Third	24.2%	25.2%	26.6%	25.9%	25.2%
CLaskhelp Asked another student to help you understand course material	Never	14.0%	12.1%	10.3%	12.0%	12.5%
	Sometimes	45.3%	45.7%	45.3%	44.1%	45.0%
	Often	27.3%	27.8%	28.7%	28.7%	28.0%
	Very often	13.3%	14.5%	15.7%	15.2%	14.5%
Clexplain Explained course material to one or more students	Never	6.7%	4.1%	3.3%	4.1%	4.8%
	Sometimes	35.0%	35.5%	36.5%	35.5%	35.4%
	Often	36.9%	38.1%	38.2%	38.4%	37.9%
	Very often	21.3%	22.3%	22.0%	22.0%	21.9%
CLstudy Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Never	17.9%	16.7%	13.8%	16.1%	16.6%
	Sometimes	34.2%	36.4%	36.6%	35.8%	35.6%
	Often	27.9%	27.1%	28.7%	27.4%	27.5%
	Very often	20.0%	19.8%	20.9%	20.7%	20.2%
CLproject Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	Never	7.2%	5.5%	4.4%	5.9%	6.1%
	Sometimes	30.1%	29.4%	29.1%	29.4%	29.6%
	Often	35.2%	35.3%	34.8%	34.5%	35.0%
	Very often	27.5%	29.8%	31.7%	30.1%	29.4%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
Discussions with Diverse Others	Lowest Third	38.1%	35.7%	38.1%	33.2%	35.8%	
	Middle Third	32.9%	31.1%	31.8%	31.8%	31.9%	
	Highest Third	29.0%	33.2%	30.1%	35.0%	32.3%	
DDrace Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	Never	4.4%	5.3%	3.9%	4.5%	4.7%	
	Sometimes	24.8%	24.1%	23.5%	22.5%	23.8%	
	Often	28.6%	27.9%	27.2%	28.1%	28.1%	
	Very often	42.2%	42.8%	45.3%	44.9%	43.5%	
DDeconomic Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	Never	3.4%	4.2%	3.0%	3.9%	3.8%	
	Sometimes	21.8%	22.0%	21.9%	21.1%	21.6%	
	Often	33.3%	33.2%	32.1%	32.9%	33.1%	
	Very often	41.5%	40.5%	42.9%	42.1%	41.5%	
DDreligion Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	Never	6.4%	5.7%	8.8%	5.1%	5.9%	
	Sometimes	29.1%	24.0%	28.2%	22.4%	25.3%	
	Often	28.3%	30.1%	25.6%	30.0%	29.2%	
	Very often	36.2%	40.3%	37.4%	42.5%	39.6%	
DDpolitical Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	Never	4.7%	5.5%	4.4%	5.0%	5.0%	
	Sometimes	26.7%	23.8%	26.9%	22.1%	24.3%	
	Often	31.6%	31.3%	31.0%	31.2%	31.3%	
	Very often	37.0%	39.5%	37.6%	41.7%	39.3%	
Student-Faculty Interaction		Lowest Third	32.6%	37.5%	36.2%	41.4%	37.3%
		Middle Third	32.8%	32.1%	35.2%	32.3%	32.6%
		Highest Third	34.6%	30.4%	28.6%	26.3%	30.1%
Sfcareer Talked about career plans with a faculty member	Never	14.2%	16.5%	14.9%	18.7%	16.4%	
	Sometimes	35.8%	38.5%	40.6%	40.9%	38.7%	
	Often	27.2%	25.4%	26.5%	23.8%	25.5%	
	Very often	22.8%	19.5%	18.1%	16.6%	19.4%	
SFotherwork Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Never	38.4%	43.7%	39.4%	44.8%	42.2%	
	Sometimes	30.2%	28.8%	31.4%	28.6%	29.3%	
	Often	17.6%	15.0%	17.3%	15.1%	15.9%	
	Very often	13.8%	12.5%	12.0%	11.5%	12.5%	
SFdiscuss Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	Never	21.4%	24.1%	21.3%	26.6%	23.9%	
	Sometimes	38.4%	40.2%	44.0%	41.6%	40.4%	
	Often	24.3%	22.0%	22.6%	20.3%	22.2%	
	Very often	15.9%	13.7%	12.1%	11.5%	13.5%	
SFperform Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	Never	19.3%	20.8%	23.2%	24.6%	21.8%	
	Sometimes	43.1%	43.3%	46.5%	44.8%	44.0%	
	Often	23.5%	22.4%	19.9%	19.8%	21.7%	
	Very often	14.1%	13.4%	10.4%	10.7%	12.5%	
Effective Teaching Practices		Lowest Third	33.3%	37.6%	40.3%	42.7%	38.2%
		Middle Third	33.2%	31.6%	33.3%	31.6%	32.2%
		Highest Third	33.6%	30.8%	26.4%	25.7%	29.6%
ETgoals Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	Very little	1.4%	1.9%	1.5%	2.0%	1.8%	
	Some	13.2%	15.1%	15.2%	16.5%	15.0%	
	Quite a bit	42.8%	42.2%	46.1%	43.7%	43.1%	
	Very much	42.6%	40.8%	37.2%	37.7%	40.1%	
ETorganize Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	Very little	1.8%	2.5%	1.6%	2.5%	2.2%	
	Some	13.8%	16.7%	15.6%	17.8%	16.2%	
	Quite a bit	44.2%	43.8%	47.4%	45.6%	44.8%	
	Very much	40.1%	37.0%	35.3%	34.1%	36.9%	
ETexample Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	Very little	2.5%	3.0%	2.1%	2.9%	2.8%	
	Some	15.6%	16.8%	15.7%	18.0%	16.8%	
	Quite a bit	39.0%	39.1%	42.4%	40.7%	39.8%	
	Very much	42.9%	41.1%	39.9%	38.3%	40.6%	

Seniors		Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
Variables	Response labels	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
ETdraftfb Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Very little	7.5%	9.2%	10.8%	12.4%	9.9%	
	Some	24.3%	26.6%	30.3%	30.4%	27.4%	
	Quite a bit	34.5%	33.6%	33.8%	32.1%	33.4%	
	Very much	33.7%	30.6%	25.1%	25.1%	29.3%	
ETfeedback Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Very little	4.5%	6.6%	5.9%	8.0%	6.4%	
	Some	22.1%	25.2%	27.9%	28.7%	25.6%	
	Quite a bit	39.9%	38.0%	40.0%	37.8%	38.6%	
	Very much	33.4%	30.3%	26.2%	25.5%	29.4%	
Quality of Interactions		Lowest Third	33.7%	40.7%	43.3%	45.8%	40.5%
		Middle Third	26.9%	25.9%	26.9%	26.1%	26.3%
		Highest Third	39.5%	33.4%	29.8%	28.2%	33.2%
Q1studentR Quality of interactions with students	Poor	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	1.2%	1.0%	
	2	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%	
	3	3.2%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.5%	
	4	7.4%	8.5%	7.5%	8.6%	8.1%	
	5	19.9%	21.4%	20.7%	21.7%	21.0%	
	6	30.3%	30.5%	32.2%	31.0%	30.7%	
	Excellent	35.8%	32.5%	33.9%	31.4%	33.2%	
Q1advisorR Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Not applicable	1.2%	0.9%	0.3%	0.8%	0.9%	
	Poor	3.3%	5.1%	5.0%	6.1%	4.9%	
	2	3.8%	5.4%	6.4%	6.3%	5.3%	
	3	5.6%	7.2%	8.3%	8.7%	7.3%	
	4	9.5%	11.6%	13.5%	13.2%	11.7%	
	5	16.4%	17.2%	18.8%	18.3%	17.4%	
	6	22.4%	21.2%	20.8%	20.4%	21.2%	
Q1facultyR Quality of interactions with faculty	Excellent	37.6%	30.7%	25.6%	25.8%	30.8%	
	Not applicable	1.4%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.4%	
	Poor	0.9%	1.4%	1.0%	1.7%	1.3%	
	2	1.3%	2.1%	1.7%	2.5%	2.0%	
	3	2.9%	4.4%	3.9%	5.1%	4.2%	
	4	7.5%	9.8%	9.7%	11.7%	9.8%	
	5	19.0%	21.4%	22.8%	24.0%	21.6%	
Q1staffR Quality of interactions with student services staff	6	32.7%	31.2%	33.2%	30.6%	31.6%	
	Excellent	35.0%	29.1%	27.2%	23.7%	28.9%	
	Not applicable	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	
	Poor	4.3%	5.2%	5.0%	5.1%	4.9%	
	2	4.7%	5.0%	5.6%	5.1%	5.0%	
	3	6.9%	7.1%	8.4%	7.6%	7.3%	
	4	12.1%	12.2%	15.0%	13.8%	12.9%	
Q1adminR Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	5	18.3%	17.6%	21.2%	19.0%	18.5%	
	6	19.5%	18.1%	19.4%	18.1%	18.6%	
	Excellent	19.1%	16.4%	15.2%	14.6%	16.5%	
	Not applicable	15.2%	18.4%	10.2%	16.6%	16.3%	
	Poor	4.3%	5.9%	5.6%	6.4%	5.6%	
	2	5.2%	6.0%	6.1%	6.7%	6.0%	
	3	8.0%	8.6%	9.3%	9.2%	8.7%	
	4	13.6%	14.7%	16.3%	16.1%	15.0%	
	5	20.7%	20.8%	21.6%	21.2%	21.0%	
	6	22.6%	21.4%	20.3%	19.7%	21.1%	
	Excellent	23.0%	18.2%	15.7%	14.7%	18.3%	
	Not applicable	2.6%	4.3%	5.0%	5.9%	4.4%	

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC					
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total	
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	
Supportive Environment	Lowest Third	31.5%	38.6%	33.0%	37.9%	35.9%	
	Middle Third	35.5%	34.5%	36.5%	35.1%	35.1%	
	Highest Third	33.0%	27.0%	30.5%	27.0%	29.0%	
SEacademic Institutional emphasis:	Very little	3.3%	5.0%	3.9%	5.3%	4.5%	
Providing support to help students succeed academically	Some	17.9%	22.6%	22.2%	24.5%	21.8%	
	Quite a bit	41.1%	41.7%	42.7%	42.1%	41.8%	
	Very much	37.7%	30.7%	31.2%	28.0%	31.9%	
SElearnup Institutional emphasis:	Very little	6.7%	8.8%	6.8%	8.8%	8.1%	
Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	Some	21.0%	24.2%	25.5%	26.1%	24.0%	
	Quite a bit	37.5%	36.8%	39.5%	37.4%	37.4%	
	Very much	34.8%	30.2%	28.2%	27.6%	30.6%	
SEdiverse Institutional emphasis:	Very little	13.4%	15.9%	15.8%	16.9%	15.5%	
Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	Some	30.5%	32.1%	32.1%	32.8%	31.9%	
	Quite a bit	31.4%	30.4%	29.7%	29.6%	30.4%	
	Very much	24.7%	21.6%	22.5%	20.7%	22.3%	
SEsocial Institutional emphasis:	Very little	7.1%	8.0%	6.0%	7.4%	7.4%	
Providing opportunities to be involved socially	Some	22.3%	25.8%	22.3%	24.8%	24.2%	
	Quite a bit	37.6%	38.2%	38.7%	38.6%	38.2%	
	Very much	33.0%	28.1%	33.0%	29.3%	30.2%	
SEwellness Institutional emphasis:	Very little	9.6%	10.5%	8.5%	9.5%	9.8%	
Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	Some	24.7%	26.2%	24.3%	24.7%	25.2%	
	Quite a bit	36.9%	36.3%	37.3%	37.1%	36.8%	
	Very much	28.8%	27.0%	29.9%	28.7%	28.2%	
SEnonacad Institutional emphasis:	Very little	28.1%	34.0%	28.6%	34.3%	32.0%	
Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	Some	35.7%	34.3%	36.1%	35.3%	35.2%	
	Quite a bit	22.9%	20.3%	22.9%	19.9%	21.1%	
	Very much	13.3%	11.4%	12.4%	10.5%	11.7%	
SEactivities Institutional emphasis:	Very little	12.3%	13.6%	9.8%	10.7%	12.0%	
Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	Some	24.6%	30.4%	26.0%	27.9%	27.6%	
	Quite a bit	36.0%	34.4%	37.6%	35.8%	35.5%	
	Very much	27.1%	21.7%	26.7%	25.5%	24.8%	
SEevents Institutional emphasis:	Very little	15.4%	17.6%	13.4%	17.1%	16.5%	
Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	Some	31.2%	36.0%	34.2%	37.2%	34.9%	
	Quite a bit	32.6%	30.1%	33.1%	30.0%	31.0%	
	Very much	20.8%	16.3%	19.3%	15.7%	17.6%	
Perceived Gains in Learning and Development		Lowest Third	32.0%	37.9%	33.6%	40.5%	36.7%
		Middle Third	34.5%	32.3%	35.5%	32.4%	33.2%
		Highest Third	33.5%	29.8%	30.8%	27.1%	30.1%
PGwrite Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	Very little	3.9%	5.8%	4.8%	7.4%	5.7%	
	Some	16.5%	20.5%	19.2%	23.2%	20.1%	
	Quite a bit	36.2%	36.6%	37.5%	36.2%	36.4%	
	Very much	43.5%	37.1%	38.5%	33.2%	37.8%	
PGspeak Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	Very little	5.7%	7.3%	6.0%	9.2%	7.3%	
	Some	19.1%	22.5%	22.4%	25.2%	22.4%	
	Quite a bit	36.9%	36.6%	37.3%	35.4%	36.4%	
	Very much	38.2%	33.6%	34.2%	30.2%	33.9%	
PGthink Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	Very little	1.7%	2.6%	1.5%	2.7%	2.3%	
	Some	9.8%	13.0%	10.4%	13.3%	12.0%	
	Quite a bit	34.0%	36.9%	34.8%	36.2%	35.7%	
	Very much	54.5%	47.5%	53.4%	47.8%	50.1%	
PGanalyze Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	Very little	12.7%	11.4%	11.4%	10.5%	11.5%	
	Some	29.0%	27.4%	25.9%	25.6%	27.2%	
	Quite a bit	29.7%	31.6%	30.5%	31.6%	31.0%	
	Very much	28.6%	29.6%	32.2%	32.4%	30.4%	

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
PGwork Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	Very little	7.1%	8.5%	7.5%	9.6%	8.3%
	Some	21.6%	22.1%	22.3%	23.4%	22.4%
	Quite a bit	33.2%	33.0%	32.4%	32.4%	32.8%
	Very much	38.1%	36.5%	37.8%	34.6%	36.5%
PGothers Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	Very little	4.0%	5.2%	3.8%	5.9%	4.9%
	Some	18.8%	20.5%	19.9%	22.2%	20.5%
	Quite a bit	37.3%	36.5%	37.4%	36.7%	36.9%
	Very much	39.9%	37.8%	38.9%	35.2%	37.7%
PGvalues Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	Very little	7.1%	12.4%	8.7%	14.5%	11.3%
	Some	20.5%	24.9%	22.0%	27.0%	24.1%
	Quite a bit	33.1%	31.2%	32.2%	30.7%	31.7%
	Very much	39.3%	31.4%	37.1%	27.7%	33.0%
PGdiverse Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	Very little	8.8%	10.8%	10.2%	12.0%	10.6%
	Some	25.9%	27.1%	27.7%	28.3%	27.2%
	Quite a bit	32.8%	31.7%	32.7%	31.5%	32.0%
	Very much	32.5%	30.5%	29.3%	28.2%	30.3%
PGprobsolve Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	Very little	8.0%	10.2%	8.1%	10.3%	9.5%
	Some	26.3%	27.4%	26.4%	27.5%	27.0%
	Quite a bit	35.4%	33.9%	35.7%	33.8%	34.4%
	Very much	30.2%	28.6%	29.7%	28.3%	29.1%
PGcitizen Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	Very little	10.0%	12.9%	11.1%	14.4%	12.4%
	Some	27.1%	29.1%	29.1%	30.4%	28.9%
	Quite a bit	33.6%	31.6%	33.9%	31.5%	32.3%
	Very much	29.4%	26.4%	25.9%	23.7%	26.4%
Satisfaction with the Institutional Experience	Lowest Third	41.0%	49.3%	40.4%	47.5%	45.7%
	Middle Third	18.7%	19.7%	18.9%	20.2%	19.5%
	Highest Third	40.3%	31.0%	40.8%	32.3%	34.8%
evalexp How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	Poor	1.5%	2.1%	1.5%	2.3%	2.0%
	Fair	7.9%	11.1%	8.4%	11.2%	10.0%
	Good	38.6%	46.8%	38.6%	46.1%	43.6%
	Excellent	52.0%	39.9%	51.5%	40.4%	44.4%
sameinst If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	Definitely no	4.3%	4.6%	3.9%	4.3%	4.3%
	Probably no	12.0%	12.9%	11.8%	11.9%	12.2%
	Probably yes	35.2%	39.7%	34.2%	38.5%	37.6%
	Definitely yes	48.6%	42.8%	50.1%	45.4%	45.8%
Additional Items						
tmprephrs Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	0 hrs	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
	1-5 hrs	12.0%	14.9%	11.8%	13.7%	13.4%
	6-10 hrs	22.6%	24.6%	22.8%	23.2%	23.4%
	11-15 hrs	20.0%	20.0%	20.3%	19.6%	19.9%
	16-20 hrs	18.3%	16.7%	18.0%	16.9%	17.3%
	21-25 hrs	11.6%	9.8%	11.4%	10.8%	10.7%
	26-30 hrs	7.3%	6.2%	7.0%	6.6%	6.7%
reading Of the time you spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how many hours are on ASSIGNED READING?	> 30 hrs	8.1%	7.6%	8.4%	8.9%	8.2%
	Very little	8.2%	11.8%	9.9%	15.8%	11.8%
	Some	22.5%	25.4%	22.7%	28.0%	25.2%
	About half	29.2%	27.7%	25.7%	25.0%	27.2%
	Most	28.0%	24.1%	28.3%	21.6%	24.8%
	Almost all	12.1%	11.0%	13.4%	9.5%	11.1%

Seniors

Variables	Response labels	Special Comparison Categories for CIC				
		BA/MA Private	BA/MA Public	Doc Private	Doc Public	Total
		N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
wrshort Number of written papers or reports: Up to 5 pages	None	3.2%	5.5%	4.1%	6.8%	5.1%
	1-2	14.8%	19.8%	15.9%	20.9%	18.5%
	3-5	26.8%	28.7%	26.5%	27.8%	27.7%
	6-10	24.2%	21.7%	23.6%	20.9%	22.3%
	11-15	12.5%	10.3%	12.6%	10.3%	11.1%
	16-20	7.5%	5.9%	7.4%	5.8%	6.4%
wrmed Number of written papers or reports: Between 6 and 10 pages	> 20 papers	11.0%	8.1%	9.9%	7.7%	8.9%
	None	13.4%	21.2%	17.0%	24.2%	19.6%
	1-2	34.2%	36.4%	35.0%	36.5%	35.7%
	3-5	31.5%	26.1%	29.0%	24.1%	27.2%
	6-10	14.2%	10.9%	13.2%	10.0%	11.8%
	11-15	4.0%	3.2%	3.7%	3.0%	3.4%
wrlong Number of written papers or reports: 11 pages or more	16-20	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%
	> 20 papers	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%
	None	33.8%	43.3%	37.6%	45.9%	41.0%
	1-2	43.8%	38.3%	40.9%	36.1%	39.4%
	3-5	15.2%	11.7%	14.3%	11.0%	12.7%
	6-10	4.1%	3.5%	4.1%	3.7%	3.8%
challenge To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	11-15	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%
	16-20	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
	> 20 papers	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%
	1 Not at all	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
	2	0.9%	1.2%	1.0%	1.4%	1.1%
	3	2.4%	2.7%	2.7%	3.2%	2.8%
empstudy Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	4	7.1%	8.0%	8.7%	9.1%	8.1%
	5	26.5%	26.8%	29.5%	28.8%	27.6%
	6	34.1%	32.4%	34.4%	32.0%	32.9%
	7 Very Much	28.6%	28.4%	23.3%	24.9%	27.0%
	Very little	1.5%	2.0%	1.7%	2.0%	1.9%
	Some	13.5%	16.2%	13.6%	16.4%	15.3%
studying and on academic work	Quite a bit	43.8%	44.3%	43.0%	43.5%	43.8%
	Very much	41.2%	37.5%	41.7%	38.1%	39.1%

Appendix H: Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Comparisons by Carnegie/Control Groups—First-Year Students

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Higher-Order Learning	BA/MA Private	67,039	40.3	13.3	.05			
	BA/MA Public	62,190	38.6	14.0	.06	1.69	***	.12
	Doc Private	16,561	40.3	13.3	.10	.00		.00
	Doc Public	59,079	38.7	13.7	.06	1.58	***	.12
	Total	204,869	39.3	13.7	.03			
Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	BA/MA Private	68,759	3.0	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,979	3.0	.8	.00	.07	***	.08
	Doc Private	17,020	3.1	.8	.01	-.05	***	-.06
	Doc Public	60,559	3.0	.8	.00	.00		.00
	Total	210,317	3.0	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	BA/MA Private	68,494	3.1	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,695	2.9	.8	.00	.11	***	.13
	Doc Private	16,934	3.1	.8	.01	-.01		-.02
	Doc Public	60,341	3.0	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	209,464	3.0	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	BA/MA Private	68,503	3.0	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,677	2.9	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Doc Private	16,945	3.0	.8	.01	.03	**	.03
	Doc Public	60,362	2.9	.8	.00	.13	***	.16
	Total	209,487	2.9	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	BA/MA Private	68,345	3.0	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,534	2.9	.8	.00	.08	***	.09
	Doc Private	16,900	2.9	.8	.01	.03	***	.04
	Doc Public	60,186	2.9	.9	.00	.10	***	.12
	Total	208,965	2.9	.8	.00			
Reflective & Integrative Learning	BA/MA Private	69,690	36.8	12.3	.05			
	BA/MA Public	64,915	35.2	12.6	.05	1.57	***	.13
	Doc Private	17,269	36.6	12.2	.09	.14		.01
	Doc Public	61,503	35.1	12.6	.05	1.67	***	.13
	Total	213,377	35.8	12.5	.03			
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	BA/MA Private	70,761	2.7	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	66,043	2.7	.9	.00	.04	***	.05
	Doc Private	17,598	2.7	.8	.01	-.02		-.02
	Doc Public	62,725	2.7	.9	.00	.02	***	.03
	Total	217,127	2.7	.8	.00			
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	BA/MA Private	69,926	2.7	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	65,187	2.6	.9	.00	.10	***	.11
	Doc Private	17,369	2.7	.9	.01	.00		.00
	Doc Public	61,833	2.6	.9	.00	.11	***	.12
	Total	214,315	2.6	.9	.00			
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	BA/MA Private	69,950	2.7	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	65,206	2.5	.9	.00	.14	***	.16
	Doc Private	17,376	2.7	.9	.01	.03	**	.03
	Doc Public	61,868	2.5	.9	.00	.16	***	.18
	Total	214,400	2.6	.9	.00			
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	BA/MA Private	69,853	2.8	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	65,044	2.8	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Doc Private	17,345	2.8	.8	.01	.03	**	.03
	Doc Public	61,672	2.7	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	213,914	2.8	.8	.00			

First-Year Students

BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	BA/MA Private	69,657	2.9	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,858	2.9	.8	.00	.04	***	.05
	Doc Private	17,279	2.9	.8	.01	.02	*	.02
	Doc Public	61,575	2.8	.8	.00	.06	***	.07
	Total	213,369	2.9	.8	.00			
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	BA/MA Private	69,438	2.9	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,694	2.8	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Doc Private	17,206	2.9	.8	.01	.00		
	Doc Public	61,342	2.8	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	212,680	2.9	.8	.00			
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	BA/MA Private	69,071	3.1	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,393	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.11
	Doc Private	17,107	3.1	.7	.01	.00		
	Doc Public	60,971	3.1	.8	.00	.07	***	.10
	Total	211,542	3.1	.8	.00			
Quantitative Reasoning	BA/MA Private	68,121	26.6	16.3	.06			
	BA/MA Public	63,269	26.7	16.4	.07	-.12		-.01
	Doc Private	16,828	26.9	16.3	.13	-.31		-.02
	Doc Public	59,965	27.8	16.2	.07	-1.17	***	-.07
	Total	208,183	27.0	16.3	.04			
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	BA/MA Private	68,858	2.5	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,028	2.5	.9	.00	-.02	**	-.02
	Doc Private	17,024	2.5	.9	.01	-.01		-.02
	Doc Public	60,603	2.6	.9	.00	-.08	***	-.09
	Total	210,513	2.5	.9	.00			
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	BA/MA Private	68,702	2.2	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,872	2.3	.9	.00	-.01		-.01
	Doc Private	16,974	2.2	.9	.01	.00		.00
	Doc Public	60,492	2.3	.9	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Total	210,040	2.3	.9	.00			
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	BA/MA Private	68,414	2.2	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,565	2.2	.9	.00	.02	*	.02
	Doc Private	16,914	2.3	.9	.01	-.03	**	-.03
	Doc Public	60,206	2.3	.9	.00	-.05	***	-.05
	Total	209,099	2.3	.9	.00			
Learning Strategies	BA/MA Private	63,250	40.3	13.9	.06			
	BA/MA Public	58,171	39.5	14.1	.06	.79	***	.06
	Doc Private	15,583	39.8	13.9	.11	.43	**	.03
	Doc Public	54,736	39.0	14.1	.06	1.22	***	.09
	Total	191,740	39.6	14.0	.03			
Identified key information from reading assignments	BA/MA Private	64,535	3.2	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	59,318	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.14
	Doc Private	15,923	3.2	.7	.01	.00		.00
	Doc Public	55,786	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.15
	Total	195,562	3.2	.8	.00			
Reviewed your notes after class	BA/MA Private	64,334	2.9	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	59,161	3.0	.9	.00	-.02	***	-.02
	Doc Private	15,862	2.9	.9	.01	.04	***	.05
	Doc Public	55,634	2.9	.9	.00	.02	***	.03
	Total	194,991	2.9	.9	.00			

First-Year Students	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials		BA/MA Private	63,610	2.9	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	58,501	2.8	.9	.00	.03	***	.04
		Doc Private	15,665	2.8	.9	.01	.03	*	.03
		Doc Public	55,061	2.8	.9	.00	.05	***	.05
		Total	192,837	2.8	.9	.00			
Collaborative Learning		BA/MA Private	70,745	33.5	13.7	.05			
		BA/MA Public	66,257	32.0	13.8	.05	1.40	***	.10
		Doc Private	17,628	33.3	13.7	.10	.12		.01
		Doc Public	63,061	33.1	14.0	.06	.33	***	.02
		Total	217,691	32.9	13.8	.03			
Asked another student to help you understand course material		BA/MA Private	73,828	2.6	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	69,519	2.6	.9	.00	.04	***	.05
		Doc Private	18,412	2.6	.9	.01	.00		.00
		Doc Public	66,271	2.6	.9	.00	-.02	***	-.02
		Total	228,030	2.6	.9	.00			
Explained course material to one or more students		BA/MA Private	72,249	2.7	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	67,775	2.7	.8	.00	.04	***	.04
		Doc Private	18,029	2.8	.8	.01	-.01		-.01
		Doc Public	64,567	2.8	.8	.00	-.02	**	-.02
		Total	222,620	2.7	.8	.00			
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students		BA/MA Private	72,285	2.6	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	67,852	2.5	1.0	.00	.12	***	.12
		Doc Private	18,036	2.6	.9	.01	-.02		-.02
		Doc Public	64,614	2.6	1.0	.00	.03	***	.03
		Total	222,787	2.6	1.0	.00			
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments		BA/MA Private	72,024	2.7	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	67,568	2.6	.9	.00	.08	***	.10
		Doc Private	17,973	2.6	.8	.01	.05	***	.06
		Doc Public	64,318	2.6	.9	.00	.07	***	.08
		Total	221,883	2.6	.9	.00			
Discussions with Diverse Others		BA/MA Private	64,074	41.2	15.1	.06			
		BA/MA Public	58,833	40.2	16.2	.07	.95	***	.06
		Doc Private	15,780	41.7	15.2	.12	-.53	**	-.03
		Doc Public	55,420	41.7	15.7	.07	-.52	***	-.03
		Total	194,107	41.1	15.6	.04			
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own		BA/MA Private	64,913	3.1	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	59,691	3.0	.9	.00	.09	***	.09
		Doc Private	15,992	3.2	.9	.01	-.06	***	-.06
		Doc Public	56,203	3.1	.9	.00	.01		.01
		Total	196,799	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own		BA/MA Private	64,747	3.1	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	59,544	3.0	.9	.00	.10	***	.12
		Doc Private	15,955	3.2	.9	.01	-.03	*	-.03
		Doc Public	56,035	3.1	.9	.00	.04	***	.05
		Total	196,281	3.1	.9	.00			
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own		BA/MA Private	64,594	3.0	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	59,361	3.0	.9	.00	-.01		-.01
		Doc Private	15,922	3.0	1.0	.01	-.01		-.01
		Doc Public	55,911	3.1	.9	.00	-.09	***	-.09
		Total	195,788	3.0	.9	.00			

First-Year Students**BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups**

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	BA/MA Private	64,377	3.0	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	59,139	3.0	.9	.00	.01		.02
	Doc Private	15,862	3.0	.9	.01	-.02		-.02
	Doc Public	55,696	3.0	.9	.00	-.07	***	-.08
	Total	195,074	3.0	.9	.00			
Student-Faculty Interaction	BA/MA Private	68,233	22.4	14.3	.05			
	BA/MA Public	63,487	20.3	14.8	.06	2.12	***	.15
	Doc Private	16,887	19.7	13.7	.11	2.67	***	.18
	Doc Public	60,132	19.5	14.3	.06	2.85	***	.20
	Total	208,739	20.7	14.4	.03			
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	BA/MA Private	69,440	2.3	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,636	2.2	.9	.00	.08	***	.08
	Doc Private	17,189	2.2	.9	.01	.15	***	.17
	Doc Public	61,163	2.2	.9	.00	.11	***	.13
	Total	212,428	2.2	.9	.00			
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	BA/MA Private	69,155	1.8	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,353	1.7	.9	.00	.10	***	.11
	Doc Private	17,106	1.7	.9	.01	.13	***	.14
	Doc Public	60,922	1.7	.9	.00	.11	***	.12
	Total	211,536	1.7	.9	.00			
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	BA/MA Private	69,057	2.1	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,294	2.0	.9	.00	.14	***	.16
	Doc Private	17,087	2.0	.9	.01	.11	***	.13
	Doc Public	60,813	2.0	.9	.00	.18	***	.20
	Total	211,251	2.0	.9	.00			
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	BA/MA Private	68,794	2.2	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,033	2.1	.9	.00	.10	***	.11
	Doc Private	17,044	2.1	.8	.01	.15	***	.17
	Doc Public	60,607	2.1	.9	.00	.16	***	.19
	Total	210,478	2.1	.9	.00			
Effective Teaching Practices	BA/MA Private	68,852	41.7	12.7	.05			
	BA/MA Public	64,059	40.1	13.3	.05	1.64	***	.13
	Doc Private	17,030	40.2	12.5	.10	1.53	***	.12
	Doc Public	60,621	39.0	12.9	.05	2.75	***	.21
	Total	210,562	40.3	13.0	.03			
Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	BA/MA Private	68,987	3.2	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,176	3.2	.8	.00	.05	***	.07
	Doc Private	17,072	3.2	.7	.01	.05	***	.07
	Doc Public	60,727	3.1	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Total	210,962	3.2	.8	.00			
Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	BA/MA Private	68,798	3.2	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	64,031	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.11
	Doc Private	17,008	3.1	.7	.01	.03	***	.04
	Doc Public	60,554	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	210,391	3.1	.8	.00			
Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	BA/MA Private	68,614	3.2	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,837	3.1	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Doc Private	16,976	3.1	.8	.01	.03	**	.03
	Doc Public	60,409	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	209,836	3.1	.8	.00			

First-Year Students		BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups						
		Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	MD	Sig.
Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	BA/MA Private	68,614	3.0	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,766	2.9	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
	Doc Private	16,964	2.8	.9	.01	.13	***	.14
	Doc Public	60,408	2.7	.9	.00	.23	***	.25
	Total	209,752	2.9	.9	.00			
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	BA/MA Private	68,313	2.9	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	63,558	2.8	.9	.00	.12	***	.13
	Doc Private	16,879	2.8	.9	.01	.14	***	.16
	Doc Public	60,125	2.7	.9	.00	.24	***	.27
	Total	208,875	2.8	.9	.00			
Quality of Interactions	BA/MA Private	62,425	43.6	11.5	.05			
	BA/MA Public	56,406	40.9	12.6	.05	2.75	***	.23
	Doc Private	15,115	42.0	11.7	.10	1.63	***	.13
	Doc Public	52,920	40.8	12.1	.05	2.79	***	.23
	Total	186,866	41.9	12.1	.03			
Quality of interactions with students	BA/MA Private	64,222	5.8	1.3	.01			
	BA/MA Public	58,927	5.5	1.4	.01	.22	***	.16
	Doc Private	15,845	5.7	1.3	.01	.06	***	.04
	Doc Public	55,525	5.6	1.4	.01	.16	***	.12
	Total	194,519	5.6	1.4	.00			
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	BA/MA Private	64,066	5.3	1.7	.01			
	BA/MA Public	58,797	5.1	1.8	.01	.20	***	.11
	Doc Private	15,805	5.2	1.8	.01	.11	***	.07
	Doc Public	55,402	5.1	1.8	.01	.19	***	.11
	Total	194,070	5.2	1.8	.00			
Quality of interactions with faculty	BA/MA Private	63,732	5.6	1.3	.01			
	BA/MA Public	58,497	5.2	1.5	.01	.34	***	.23
	Doc Private	15,719	5.4	1.4	.01	.20	***	.14
	Doc Public	55,081	5.2	1.5	.01	.41	***	.28
	Total	193,029	5.3	1.5	.00			
Quality of interactions with student services staff	BA/MA Private	63,813	5.4	1.9	.01			
	BA/MA Public	58,587	5.3	2.0	.01	.15	***	.08
	Doc Private	15,742	5.3	1.8	.01	.13	***	.07
	Doc Public	55,215	5.3	2.0	.01	.15	***	.08
	Total	193,357	5.3	1.9	.00			
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	BA/MA Private	63,855	5.2	1.8	.01			
	BA/MA Public	58,611	5.0	2.0	.01	.20	***	.11
	Doc Private	15,758	5.2	2.0	.02	.05		.02
	Doc Public	55,209	5.1	2.0	.01	.17	***	.09
	Total	193,433	5.1	1.9	.00			
Supportive Environment	BA/MA Private	60,136	39.1	13.3	.05			
	BA/MA Public	54,423	37.2	13.9	.06	1.92	***	.14
	Doc Private	14,794	38.3	13.2	.11	.79	***	.06
	Doc Public	51,122	37.8	13.4	.06	1.32	***	.10
	Total	180,475	38.1	13.5	.03			
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	BA/MA Private	60,342	3.2	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,558	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.14
	Doc Private	14,857	3.1	.8	.01	.08	***	.09
	Doc Public	51,341	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.13
	Total	181,098	3.2	.8	.00			

First-Year Students

BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	BA/MA Private	60,297	3.2	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,640	3.2	.9	.00	.06	***	.07
	Doc Private	14,869	3.2	.9	.01	.07	***	.08
	Doc Public	51,326	3.1	.9	.00	.08	***	.09
	Total	181,132	3.2	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	BA/MA Private	60,416	2.8	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,710	2.7	1.0	.00	.09	***	.09
	Doc Private	14,880	2.8	1.0	.01	.05	***	.05
	Doc Public	51,438	2.7	1.0	.00	.07	***	.08
	Total	181,444	2.8	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	BA/MA Private	60,356	3.1	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,656	3.0	.9	.00	.12	***	.14
	Doc Private	14,867	3.1	.9	.01	.02		.02
	Doc Public	51,358	3.1	.9	.00	.05	***	.05
	Total	181,237	3.1	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	BA/MA Private	60,123	3.1	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,386	3.0	.9	.00	.06	***	.06
	Doc Private	14,775	3.0	.9	.01	.02		.02
	Doc Public	51,123	3.1	.9	.00	-.01		-.01
	Total	180,407	3.0	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	BA/MA Private	60,082	2.5	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,346	2.4	1.0	.00	.06	***	.06
	Doc Private	14,766	2.4	1.0	.01	.04	**	.04
	Doc Public	51,051	2.4	1.0	.00	.07	***	.07
	Total	180,245	2.4	1.0	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	BA/MA Private	59,977	3.0	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,245	2.9	.9	.00	.12	***	.13
	Doc Private	14,731	3.0	.9	.01	.03	*	.03
	Doc Public	50,977	3.0	.9	.00	.03	***	.03
	Total	179,930	3.0	.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	BA/MA Private	59,827	2.7	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,134	2.6	1.0	.00	.15	***	.16
	Doc Private	14,716	2.7	.9	.01	.03	*	.03
	Doc Public	50,839	2.6	.9	.00	.14	***	.14
	Total	179,516	2.7	1.0	.00			
Perceived Gains	BA/MA Private	59,875	36.1	13.4	.05			
	BA/MA Public	54,099	34.8	14.0	.06	1.29	***	.09
	Doc Private	14,720	35.1	13.4	.11	.96	***	.07
	Doc Public	50,827	34.2	13.8	.06	1.87	***	.14
	Total	179,521	35.1	13.7	.03			
Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	BA/MA Private	60,115	3.0	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,313	2.9	.9	.00	.07	***	.07
	Doc Private	14,775	2.9	.9	.01	.07	***	.08
	Doc Public	51,067	2.8	.9	.00	.19	***	.21
	Total	180,270	2.9	.9	.00			
Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	BA/MA Private	59,923	2.8	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,138	2.7	.9	.00	.02	**	.02
	Doc Private	14,715	2.6	.9	.01	.11	***	.12
	Doc Public	50,913	2.6	1.0	.00	.17	***	.18
	Total	179,689	2.7	.9	.00			

First-Year Students	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	BA/MA Private	59,905	3.2	.8	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,128	3.1	.8	.00		.09	***	.11
	Doc Private	14,726	3.1	.8	.01		.04	***	.05
	Doc Public	50,892	3.1	.8	.00		.09	***	.12
	Total	179,651	3.1	.8	.00				
Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	BA/MA Private	59,865	2.5	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,102	2.6	1.0	.00		-.08	***	-.09
	Doc Private	14,713	2.6	1.0	.01		-.04	***	-.04
	Doc Public	50,881	2.7	1.0	.00		-.15	***	-.15
	Total	179,561	2.6	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	BA/MA Private	59,924	2.7	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,130	2.6	1.0	.00		.11	***	.11
	Doc Private	14,729	2.7	1.0	.01		.04	***	.04
	Doc Public	50,904	2.6	1.0	.00		.08	***	.09
	Total	179,687	2.6	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	BA/MA Private	59,795	2.9	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,036	2.9	.9	.00		.06	***	.07
	Doc Private	14,690	2.8	.9	.01		.09	***	.10
	Doc Public	50,801	2.8	.9	.00		.10	***	.11
	Total	179,322	2.9	.9	.00				
Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	BA/MA Private	59,827	2.9	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,060	2.7	1.0	.00		.17	***	.18
	Doc Private	14,730	2.8	1.0	.01		.05	***	.05
	Doc Public	50,798	2.6	1.0	.00		.23	***	.24
	Total	179,415	2.7	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	BA/MA Private	59,886	2.8	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,113	2.7	1.0	.00		.07	***	.07
	Doc Private	14,721	2.7	1.0	.01		.05	***	.05
	Doc Public	50,868	2.7	1.0	.00		.08	***	.09
	Total	179,588	2.8	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	BA/MA Private	59,779	2.7	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,030	2.6	.9	.00		.06	***	.06
	Doc Private	14,706	2.6	.9	.01		.03	*	.03
	Doc Public	50,796	2.6	.9	.00		.04	***	.05
	Total	179,311	2.6	.9	.00				
Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	BA/MA Private	59,557	2.7	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	53,829	2.6	1.0	.00		.08	***	.09
	Doc Private	14,653	2.7	1.0	.01		.04	***	.05
	Doc Public	50,608	2.6	1.0	.00		.10	***	.10
	Total	178,647	2.7	1.0	.00				
Overall Satisfaction	BA/MA Private	60,327	46.1	13.7	.06				
	BA/MA Public	54,559	43.8	13.4	.06		2.30	***	.17
	Doc Private	14,844	46.2	13.5	.11		-.15		-.01
	Doc Public	51,308	45.4	13.2	.06		.60	***	.04
	Total	181,038	45.2	13.5	.03				
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	BA/MA Private	60,083	3.3	.7	.00				
	BA/MA Public	54,353	3.2	.7	.00		.15	***	.22
	Doc Private	14,779	3.3	.7	.01		.01		.01
	Doc Public	51,140	3.3	.7	.00		.08	***	.12
	Total	180,355	3.3	.7	.00				

First-Year Students**BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups**

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?	BA/MA Private	60,155	3.3	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,358	3.2	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Doc Private	14,798	3.3	.8	.01	-.02	*	-.03
	Doc Public	51,157	3.3	.8	.00	-.02	***	-.03
	Total	180,468	3.3	.8	.00			
Additional Items								
Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints	BA/MA Private	60,302	15.3	8.4	.03			
	BA/MA Public	54,554	13.4	8.2	.03	1.86	***	.22
	Doc Private	14,834	16.2	8.5	.07	-.94	***	-.11
	Doc Public	51,306	14.9	8.5	.04	.45	***	.05
	Total	180,996	14.7	8.4	.02			
Estimated hours: reading recoded by NSSE using tmprephrs and reading	BA/MA Private	34,943	8.3	6.4	.03			
	BA/MA Public	38,325	6.6	5.8	.03	1.64	***	.27
	Doc Private	8,996	8.5	6.3	.07	-.21	*	-.03
	Doc Public	28,259	6.5	5.8	.03	1.74	***	.28
	Total	110,523	7.3	6.1	.02			
Estimated pages of assigned writing, recoded and summed by NSSE from wrshort, wrmed, and wrlong using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options	BA/MA Private	59,263	53.2	53.6	.22			
	BA/MA Public	54,216	42.4	53.7	.23	10.77	***	.20
	Doc Private	14,567	57.7	57.6	.48	-4.48	***	-.08
	Doc Public	51,491	44.5	56.2	.25	8.71	***	.16
	Total	179,537	47.8	55.0	.13			
To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?	BA/MA Private	64,296	5.6	1.1	.00			
	BA/MA Public	59,071	5.5	1.1	.00	.10	***	.09
	Doc Private	15,861	5.6	1.1	.01	.03		.02
	Doc Public	55,614	5.5	1.1	.00	.09	***	.08
	Total	194,842	5.6	1.1	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	BA/MA Private	60,661	3.3	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	54,915	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Doc Private	14,943	3.3	.7	.01	-.01		-.01
	Doc Public	51,606	3.2	.7	.00	.04	***	.06
	Total	182,125	3.2	.7	.00			

Appendix I: Descriptive Statistics and Statistical Comparisons by Carnegie/Control Groups—Seniors

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Higher-Order Learning	Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	BA/MA Private	80,617	42.6	13.4	.05			
		BA/MA Public	93,891	41.5	14.1	.05	1.15	***	.08
		Doc Private	21,082	41.3	13.4	.09	1.35	***	.10
		Doc Public	91,631	40.2	14.2	.05	2.39	***	.17
		Total	287,221	41.4	13.9	.03			
Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	BA/MA Private	82,643	3.2	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	96,273	3.2	.8	.00	.02	***	.02
		Doc Private	21,631	3.2	.8	.01	.01		.01
		Doc Public	93,950	3.1	.8	.00	.04	***	.05
		Total	294,497	3.2	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	BA/MA Private	82,528	3.2	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	96,060	3.1	.8	.00	.05	***	.06
		Doc Private	21,587	3.1	.8	.01	.04	***	.05
		Doc Public	93,652	3.1	.8	.00	.09	***	.11
		Total	293,827	3.1	.8	.00			
Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	BA/MA Private	82,521	3.1	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	96,071	3.0	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
		Doc Private	21,580	3.0	.9	.01	.13	***	.15
		Doc Public	93,669	2.9	.9	.00	.20	***	.23
		Total	293,841	3.0	.9	.00			
Reflective & Integrative Learning	Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	BA/MA Private	82,355	3.1	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	95,839	3.0	.8	.00	.07	***	.08
		Doc Private	21,493	3.0	.8	.01	.09	***	.11
		Doc Public	93,422	2.9	.9	.00	.14	***	.17
		Total	293,109	3.0	.8	.00			
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	BA/MA Private	83,625	40.5	12.5	.04			
		BA/MA Public	97,526	39.1	13.0	.04	1.47	***	.11
		Doc Private	21,921	39.5	12.5	.08	1.00	***	.08
		Doc Public	95,210	38.0	13.1	.04	2.56	***	.20
		Total	298,282	39.2	12.9	.02			
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	BA/MA Private	84,526	3.0	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	98,842	3.0	.8	.00	-.01		-.01
		Doc Private	22,263	3.1	.8	.01	-.02	**	-.03
		Doc Public	96,719	3.0	.8	.00	.00		.01
		Total	302,350	3.0	.8	.00			
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	BA/MA Private	83,691	3.0	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	97,689	2.9	.9	.00	.09	***	.10
		Doc Private	22,007	2.9	.9	.01	.06	***	.07
		Doc Public	95,541	2.8	.9	.00	.16	***	.18
		Total	298,928	2.9	.9	.00			

Seniors**BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups**

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	BA/MA Private	83,564	3.0	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	97,495	3.0	.8	.00	.06	***	.07
	Doc Private	21,897	3.0	.8	.01	.06	***	.07
	Doc Public	95,182	2.9	.8	.00	.11	***	.13
	Total	298,138	3.0	.8	.00			
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	BA/MA Private	83,332	3.0	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	97,162	3.0	.8	.00	.06	***	.07
	Doc Private	21,860	3.0	.8	.01	.01		.01
	Doc Public	94,873	2.9	.8	.00	.10	***	.12
	Total	297,227	3.0	.8	.00			
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	BA/MA Private	82,977	3.3	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,736	3.3	.7	.00	.05	***	.07
	Doc Private	21,725	3.3	.7	.00	.02	***	.03
	Doc Public	94,409	3.2	.8	.00	.09	***	.12
	Total	295,847	3.3	.7	.00			
Quantitative Reasoning	BA/MA Private	82,343	29.1	17.4	.06			
	BA/MA Public	95,596	29.4	17.4	.06	-.29	**	-.02
	Doc Private	21,473	30.1	17.4	.12	-1.02	***	-.06
	Doc Public	93,238	30.1	17.3	.06	-.96	***	-.06
	Total	292,650	29.6	17.4	.03			
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	BA/MA Private	83,071	2.6	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,582	2.6	1.0	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Doc Private	21,672	2.6	1.0	.01	-.06	***	-.06
	Doc Public	94,110	2.7	1.0	.00	-.09	***	-.09
	Total	295,435	2.6	1.0	.00			
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	BA/MA Private	82,908	2.4	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,353	2.4	1.0	.00	-.01		-.01
	Doc Private	21,626	2.4	1.0	.01	-.03	**	-.03
	Doc Public	93,955	2.4	1.0	.00	-.02	**	-.02
	Total	294,842	2.4	1.0	.00			
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	BA/MA Private	82,714	2.4	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,066	2.4	1.0	.00	.01		.01
	Doc Private	21,576	2.5	1.0	.01	-.07	***	-.07
	Doc Public	93,659	2.4	1.0	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Total	294,015	2.4	1.0	.00			
Learning Strategies	BA/MA Private	77,813	40.9	14.4	.05			
	BA/MA Public	88,934	40.7	14.7	.05	.23	*	.02
	Doc Private	20,127	38.7	14.6	.10	2.19	***	.15
	Doc Public	86,451	39.5	14.9	.05	1.34	***	.09
	Total	273,325	40.2	14.7	.03			
Identified key information from reading assignments	BA/MA Private	79,282	3.3	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	90,736	3.3	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
	Doc Private	20,473	3.3	.8	.01	.07	***	.09
	Doc Public	88,060	3.2	.8	.00	.12	***	.16
	Total	278,551	3.3	.8	.00			
Reviewed your notes after class	BA/MA Private	79,047	2.9	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	90,436	2.9	.9	.00	-.05	***	-.05
	Doc Private	20,420	2.7	1.0	.01	.13	***	.14
	Doc Public	87,834	2.9	.9	.00	.01		.01
	Total	277,737	2.9	.9	.00			

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	BA/MA Private	78,231	2.9	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	89,486	2.9	.9	.00		.01		.01
	Doc Private	20,235	2.8	.9	.01		.13	***	.14
	Doc Public	86,971	2.9	.9	.00		.07	***	.07
	Total	274,923	2.9	.9	.00				
Collaborative Learning	BA/MA Private	84,024	32.3	14.9	.05				
	BA/MA Public	98,391	33.1	14.3	.05		-.87	***	-.06
	Doc Private	22,195	34.0	14.1	.09		-1.71	***	-.12
	Doc Public	96,610	33.3	14.5	.05		-1.08	***	-.07
	Total	301,220	33.0	14.5	.03				
Asked another student to help you understand course material	BA/MA Private	87,144	2.4	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	102,458	2.4	.9	.00		-.05	***	-.05
	Doc Private	23,161	2.5	.9	.01		-.10	***	-.11
	Doc Public	100,645	2.5	.9	.00		-.07	***	-.08
	Total	313,408	2.4	.9	.00				
Explained course material to one or more students	BA/MA Private	85,676	2.7	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	100,567	2.8	.8	.00		-.06	***	-.07
	Doc Private	22,659	2.8	.8	.01		-.06	***	-.07
	Doc Public	98,648	2.8	.8	.00		-.05	***	-.06
	Total	307,550	2.8	.8	.00				
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	BA/MA Private	85,788	2.5	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	100,656	2.5	1.0	.00		.00		.00
	Doc Private	22,693	2.6	1.0	.01		-.07	***	-.07
	Doc Public	98,671	2.5	1.0	.00		-.03	***	-.03
	Total	307,808	2.5	1.0	.00				
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	BA/MA Private	85,570	2.8	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	100,337	2.9	.9	.00		-.06	***	-.07
	Doc Private	22,639	2.9	.9	.01		-.11	***	-.12
	Doc Public	98,467	2.9	.9	.00		-.06	***	-.07
	Total	307,013	2.9	.9	.00				
Discussions with Diverse Others	BA/MA Private	78,496	40.8	15.4	.05				
	BA/MA Public	89,793	41.4	16.2	.05		-.58	***	-.04
	Doc Private	20,319	41.1	15.3	.11		-.29		-.02
	Doc Public	87,298	42.3	15.9	.05		-1.49	***	-.09
	Total	275,906	41.5	15.8	.03				
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	BA/MA Private	79,587	3.1	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	91,162	3.1	.9	.00		.01		.01
	Doc Private	20,568	3.1	.9	.01		-.05	***	-.06
	Doc Public	88,556	3.1	.9	.00		-.05	***	-.05
	Total	279,873	3.1	.9	.00				
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	BA/MA Private	79,372	3.1	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	90,906	3.1	.9	.00		.03	***	.03
	Doc Private	20,527	3.1	.9	.01		-.02	*	-.02
	Doc Public	88,352	3.1	.9	.00		.00		.00
	Total	279,157	3.1	.9	.00				
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	BA/MA Private	79,208	2.9	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	90,653	3.0	.9	.00		-.11	***	-.11
	Doc Private	20,479	2.9	1.0	.01		.03	**	.03
	Doc Public	88,071	3.1	.9	.00		-.16	***	-.17
	Total	278,411	3.0	.9	.00				

Seniors**BA/MA Private
Compared with the
Other Groups**

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
						MD	Sig.	ES
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	BA/MA Private	78,948	3.0	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	90,306	3.0	.9	.00	-.04	***	-.04
	Doc Private	20,410	3.0	.9	.01	-.01		-.01
	Doc Public	87,737	3.1	.9	.00	-.09	***	-.10
	Total	277,401	3.0	.9	.00			
Student-Faculty Interaction	BA/MA Private	82,079	26.6	16.6	.06			
	BA/MA Public	95,494	24.9	16.5	.05	1.71	***	.10
	Doc Private	21,471	24.6	15.5	.11	2.00	***	.12
	Doc Public	93,297	23.2	16.0	.05	3.40	***	.21
	Total	292,341	24.8	16.4	.03			
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	BA/MA Private	83,360	2.6	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	97,044	2.5	1.0	.00	.11	***	.11
	Doc Private	21,834	2.5	1.0	.01	.11	***	.11
	Doc Public	94,764	2.4	1.0	.00	.20	***	.21
	Total	297,002	2.5	1.0	.00			
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	BA/MA Private	83,057	2.1	1.1	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,658	2.0	1.0	.00	.10	***	.10
	Doc Private	21,764	2.0	1.0	.01	.05	***	.05
	Doc Public	94,435	1.9	1.0	.00	.14	***	.13
	Total	295,914	2.0	1.0	.00			
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	BA/MA Private	82,984	2.3	1.0	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,626	2.3	1.0	.00	.09	***	.10
	Doc Private	21,727	2.3	.9	.01	.09	***	.09
	Doc Public	94,345	2.2	.9	.00	.18	***	.18
	Total	295,682	2.3	1.0	.00			
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	BA/MA Private	82,782	2.3	.9	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,351	2.3	.9	.00	.04	***	.04
	Doc Private	21,665	2.2	.9	.01	.15	***	.16
	Doc Public	94,035	2.2	.9	.00	.16	***	.17
	Total	294,833	2.2	.9	.00			
Effective Teaching Practices	BA/MA Private	83,082	42.7	13.1	.05			
	BA/MA Public	96,611	41.3	13.7	.04	1.41	***	.10
	Doc Private	21,691	40.6	12.9	.09	2.13	***	.16
	Doc Public	94,147	39.7	13.6	.04	2.99	***	.22
	Total	295,531	41.2	13.5	.02			
Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	BA/MA Private	83,160	3.3	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,733	3.2	.8	.00	.05	***	.06
	Doc Private	21,732	3.2	.7	.01	.08	***	.10
	Doc Public	94,301	3.2	.8	.00	.09	***	.12
	Total	295,926	3.2	.8	.00			
Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	BA/MA Private	82,932	3.2	.7	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,450	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.10
	Doc Private	21,670	3.2	.7	.01	.06	***	.08
	Doc Public	94,043	3.1	.8	.00	.11	***	.15
	Total	295,095	3.2	.8	.00			
Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	BA/MA Private	82,759	3.2	.8	.00			
	BA/MA Public	96,247	3.2	.8	.00	.04	***	.05
	Doc Private	21,616	3.2	.8	.01	.02	**	.03
	Doc Public	93,814	3.1	.8	.00	.08	***	.10
	Total	294,436	3.2	.8	.00			

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	BA/MA Private	82,739	2.9	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	96,238	2.9	1.0	.00	.09	***	.09
		Doc Private	21,601	2.7	1.0	.01	.21	***	.22
		Doc Public	93,748	2.7	1.0	.00	.24	***	.25
	Total		294,326	2.8	1.0	.00			
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	BA/MA Private	82,406	3.0	.9	.00			
		BA/MA Public	95,853	2.9	.9	.00	.10	***	.11
		Doc Private	21,517	2.9	.9	.01	.16	***	.18
		Doc Public	93,414	2.8	.9	.00	.22	***	.24
	Total		293,190	2.9	.9	.00			
Quality of Interactions	Quality of interactions with students	BA/MA Private	76,287	44.6	11.1	.04			
		BA/MA Public	86,253	42.6	11.8	.04	2.03	***	.17
		Doc Private	19,734	42.1	11.4	.08	2.57	***	.22
		Doc Public	83,726	41.2	11.8	.04	3.38	***	.29
	Total		266,000	42.7	11.6	.02			
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	Quality of interactions with academic advisors	BA/MA Private	79,083	5.9	1.3	.00			
		BA/MA Public	90,373	5.7	1.3	.00	.11	***	.08
		Doc Private	20,407	5.8	1.2	.01	.06	***	.04
		Doc Public	87,771	5.7	1.3	.00	.14	***	.11
	Total		277,634	5.8	1.3	.00			
Quality of interactions with faculty	Quality of interactions with faculty	BA/MA Private	78,939	5.6	1.7	.01			
		BA/MA Public	90,194	5.3	1.8	.01	.31	***	.17
		Doc Private	20,380	5.1	1.8	.01	.49	***	.27
		Doc Public	87,621	5.0	1.9	.01	.54	***	.30
	Total		277,134	5.3	1.8	.00			
Quality of interactions with student services staff	Quality of interactions with student services staff	BA/MA Private	78,440	5.8	1.3	.00			
		BA/MA Public	89,636	5.6	1.4	.00	.23	***	.17
		Doc Private	20,242	5.6	1.3	.01	.22	***	.16
		Doc Public	87,142	5.4	1.4	.00	.41	***	.30
	Total		275,460	5.6	1.4	.00			
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	BA/MA Private	78,681	5.6	2.1	.01			
		BA/MA Public	89,844	5.6	2.3	.01	-.01		.00
		Doc Private	20,297	5.2	2.0	.01	.39	***	.18
		Doc Public	87,296	5.5	2.2	.01	.12	***	.05
	Total		276,118	5.5	2.2	.00			
Supportive Environment	Supportive Environment	BA/MA Private	78,794	5.2	1.8	.01			
		BA/MA Public	89,978	5.0	1.9	.01	.15	***	.08
		Doc Private	20,313	5.0	1.9	.01	.21	***	.11
		Doc Public	87,457	4.9	2.0	.01	.24	***	.13
	Total		276,542	5.0	1.9	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	BA/MA Private	75,406	35.5	14.0	.05			
		BA/MA Public	84,843	33.2	14.3	.05	2.30	***	.16
		Doc Private	19,353	34.9	13.6	.10	.66	***	.05
		Doc Public	82,147	33.3	14.1	.05	2.21	***	.16
	Total		261,749	34.0	14.1	.03			

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,663	3.0	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	85,145	2.9	.9	.00	.12	***	.13	
	Doc Private	19,388	2.9	.9	.01	.11	***	.12	
	Doc Public	82,390	2.8	.9	.00	.17	***	.18	
	Total	262,586	2.9	.9	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,800	2.7	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	85,293	2.6	1.0	.00	.10	***	.10	
	Doc Private	19,444	2.6	1.0	.01	.09	***	.09	
	Doc Public	82,567	2.5	1.0	.00	.13	***	.13	
	Total	263,104	2.6	1.0	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	BA/MA Private	75,722	3.0	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	85,202	2.9	.9	.00	.10	***	.11	
	Doc Private	19,439	3.0	.9	.01	-.02	*	-.02	
	Doc Public	82,537	2.9	.9	.00	.07	***	.08	
	Total	262,900	2.9	.9	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,438	2.8	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,847	2.8	1.0	.00	.05	***	.06	
	Doc Private	19,339	2.9	.9	.01	-.04	***	-.04	
	Doc Public	82,130	2.8	.9	.00	.00		.00	
	Total	261,754	2.8	.9	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,412	2.2	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,818	2.1	1.0	.00	.12	***	.12	
	Doc Private	19,326	2.2	1.0	.01	.02	*	.02	
	Doc Public	82,060	2.1	1.0	.00	.15	***	.15	
	Total	261,616	2.1	1.0	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,196	2.8	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,584	2.6	1.0	.00	.14	***	.14	
	Doc Private	19,302	2.8	.9	.01	-.03	***	-.04	
	Doc Public	81,904	2.8	1.0	.00	.02	*	.02	
	Total	260,986	2.7	1.0	.00				
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	BA/MA Private	75,060	2.6	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,435	2.5	1.0	.00	.14	***	.14	
	Doc Private	19,261	2.6	.9	.01	.01		.01	
	Doc Public	81,735	2.4	1.0	.00	.14	***	.15	
	Total	260,491	2.5	1.0	.00				
Perceived Gains	BA/MA Private	75,277	40.4	13.1	.05				
	BA/MA Public	84,562	38.6	14.0	.05	1.83	***	.13	
	Doc Private	19,237	39.7	12.9	.09	.73	***	.05	
	Doc Public	81,875	37.6	14.0	.05	2.79	***	.20	
	Total	260,951	38.9	13.7	.03				
Perceived gains: Writing clearly and effectively	BA/MA Private	75,549	3.2	.8	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,855	3.0	.9	.00	.14	***	.16	
	Doc Private	19,299	3.1	.9	.01	.10	***	.11	
	Doc Public	82,126	3.0	.9	.00	.24	***	.27	
	Total	261,829	3.1	.9	.00				
Perceived gains: Speaking clearly and effectively	BA/MA Private	75,276	3.1	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,584	3.0	.9	.00	.11	***	.12	
	Doc Private	19,237	3.0	.9	.01	.08	***	.09	
	Doc Public	81,866	2.9	1.0	.00	.21	***	.23	
	Total	260,963	3.0	.9	.00				

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
Perceived gains: Thinking critically and analytically	BA/MA Private	75,243	3.4	.7	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,513	3.3	.8	.00	.12	***	.15	
	Doc Private	19,225	3.4	.7	.01	.01		.02	
	Doc Public	81,817	3.3	.8	.00	.12	***	.16	
	Total	260,798	3.3	.8	.00				
Perceived gains: Analyzing numerical and statistical information	BA/MA Private	75,237	2.7	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,494	2.8	1.0	.00	-.05	***	-.05	
	Doc Private	19,231	2.8	1.0	.01	-.09	***	-.09	
	Doc Public	81,808	2.9	1.0	.00	-.12	***	-.12	
	Total	260,770	2.8	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	BA/MA Private	75,354	3.0	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,674	3.0	1.0	.00	.05	***	.05	
	Doc Private	19,268	3.0	.9	.01	.02		.02	
	Doc Public	81,937	2.9	1.0	.00	.10	***	.11	
	Total	261,233	3.0	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Working effectively with others	BA/MA Private	75,157	3.1	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,430	3.1	.9	.00	.06	***	.07	
	Doc Private	19,184	3.1	.9	.01	.02		.02	
	Doc Public	81,746	3.0	.9	.00	.12	***	.14	
	Total	260,517	3.1	.9	.00				
Perceived gains: Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	BA/MA Private	75,241	3.0	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,532	2.8	1.0	.00	.23	***	.23	
	Doc Private	19,217	3.0	1.0	.01	.07	***	.07	
	Doc Public	81,864	2.7	1.0	.00	.33	***	.33	
	Total	260,854	2.9	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	BA/MA Private	75,291	2.9	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,560	2.8	1.0	.00	.07	***	.07	
	Doc Private	19,241	2.8	1.0	.01	.08	***	.08	
	Doc Public	81,870	2.8	1.0	.00	.13	***	.13	
	Total	260,962	2.8	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Solving complex real-world problems	BA/MA Private	75,226	2.9	.9	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,504	2.8	1.0	.00	.07	***	.07	
	Doc Private	19,221	2.9	.9	.01	.01		.01	
	Doc Public	81,825	2.8	1.0	.00	.08	***	.08	
	Total	260,776	2.8	1.0	.00				
Perceived gains: Being an informed and active citizen	BA/MA Private	74,860	2.8	1.0	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,116	2.7	1.0	.00	.11	***	.11	
	Doc Private	19,150	2.7	1.0	.01	.08	***	.08	
	Doc Public	81,439	2.6	1.0	.00	.18	***	.18	
	Total	259,565	2.7	1.0	.00				
Overall Satisfaction	BA/MA Private	75,790	46.9	14.1	.05				
	BA/MA Public	85,199	44.5	14.3	.05	2.38	***	.17	
	Doc Private	19,382	47.1	14.1	.10	-.14		-.01	
	Doc Public	82,502	45.0	14.4	.05	1.96	***	.14	
	Total	262,873	45.5	14.3	.03				
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	BA/MA Private	75,490	3.4	.7	.00				
	BA/MA Public	84,859	3.2	.7	.00	.17	***	.23	
	Doc Private	19,320	3.4	.7	.01	.01		.02	
	Doc Public	82,223	3.2	.7	.00	.17	***	.23	
	Total	261,892	3.3	.7	.00				

Seniors	Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SEM	BA/MA Private Compared with the Other Groups		
							MD	Sig.	ES
If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?		BA/MA Private	75,605	3.3	.8	.00			
		BA/MA Public	84,948	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
		Doc Private	19,316	3.3	.8	.01	-.03	**	-.03
		Doc Public	82,312	3.2	.8	.00	.03	***	.04
		Total	262,181	3.2	.8	.00			
Additional Items									
Estimated hours: tmprep recoded by NSSE using response range midpoints		BA/MA Private	75,661	15.4	8.8	.03			
		BA/MA Public	85,071	14.5	8.8	.03	.91	***	.10
		Doc Private	19,355	15.4	8.8	.06	.01		.00
		Doc Public	82,384	15.1	9.0	.03	.31	***	.03
		Total	262,471	15.0	8.9	.02			
Estimated hours: reading recoded by NSSE using tmpprephrs and reading		BA/MA Private	41,450	8.4	6.7	.03			
		BA/MA Public	59,809	7.4	6.5	.03	.94	***	.14
		Doc Private	11,733	8.1	6.5	.06	.27	***	.04
		Doc Public	43,296	7.0	6.2	.03	1.40	***	.22
		Total	156,288	7.6	6.5	.02			
Estimated pages of assigned writing, recoded and summed by NSSE from wrshort, wrmed, and wrlong using the midpoints of response ranges and an estimate for unbounded options		BA/MA Private	72,536	87.2	80.7	.30			
		BA/MA Public	81,945	73.9	80.0	.28	13.35	***	.17
		Doc Private	18,822	82.8	79.9	.58	4.43	***	.06
		Doc Public	80,466	71.7	80.0	.28	15.57	***	.19
		Total	253,769	77.6	80.5	.16			
To what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?		BA/MA Private	79,053	5.8	1.1	.00			
		BA/MA Public	90,352	5.7	1.2	.00	.05	***	.04
		Doc Private	20,414	5.6	1.1	.01	.13	***	.11
		Doc Public	87,716	5.6	1.2	.00	.15	***	.13
		Total	277,535	5.7	1.2	.00			
Institutional emphasis: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work		BA/MA Private	76,116	3.2	.7	.00			
		BA/MA Public	85,620	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.10
		Doc Private	19,510	3.2	.7	.01	.00		.00
		Doc Public	82,891	3.2	.8	.00	.07	***	.09
		Total	264,137	3.2	.8	.00			

Appendix J: Results for High-Impact Practices

High-Impact Practices: Statistical Comparisons by Institutional Control

First-Year Students	Private		Public	
	%		%	ES
Learning Community	13		16 ***	-.08
Service-Learning	57		50 ***	.15
Research with Faculty	5		5	.01
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	62		57 ***	.11
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	12		12 ***	-.02

Seniors	Private		Public	
	%		%	ES
Learning Community	28		25 ***	.07
Service-Learning	68		60 ***	.16
Research with Faculty	30		25 ***	.13
Internship or Field Experience	59		51 ***	.17
Study Abroad	23		12 ***	.29
Culminating Senior Experience	57		45 ***	.23
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	90		86 ***	.13
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	73		62 ***	.22

Notes: % represents the percentage of students who responded “done or in progress,” except for service-learning which represents the percentage responding at least “some.” Chi-Square tests; * p<.05, **p<.01, *** p<.001; ES=Cohen’s *h*

High-Impact Practices: Statistical Comparisons by Carnegie/Control Groups

First-Year Students	BA/MA Private		BA/MA Public		Doc Private		Doc Public	
	%		%	ES	%	ES	%	ES
Learning Community	13		14 ***	-.03	17 ***	-.11	19 ***	-.18
Service-Learning	59		52 ***	.14	50 ***	.17	48 ***	.22
Research with Faculty	6		5 ***	.03	5	.01	6	-.01
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	63		57 ***	.12	58 ***	.11	56 ***	.14
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	11		11 **	.02	12 **	-.02	13 ***	-.06

Seniors	BA/MA Private		BA/MA Public		Doc Private		Doc Public	
	%		%	ES	%	ES	%	ES
Learning Community	28		25 ***	.06	30 ***	-.04	25 ***	.06
Service-Learning	69		64 ***	.09	65 ***	.08	56 ***	.26
Research with Faculty	30		23 ***	.15	31	-.01	26 ***	.10
Internship or Field Experience	58		50 ***	.17	63 ***	-.09	52 ***	.14
Study Abroad	23		11 ***	.32	26 ***	-.09	14 ***	.22
Culminating Senior Experience	58		47 ***	.23	50 ***	.17	43 ***	.31
<i>Participated in at least one</i>	90		87 ***	.09	93 ***	-.11	86 ***	.12
<i>Participated in two or more</i>	72		63 ***	.20	75 ***	-.06	62 ***	.22

Notes: % represents the percentage of students who responded “done or in progress,” except for service-learning which represents the percentage responding at least “some.” Chi-Square tests; * p<.05, **p<.01, *** p<.001; ES=Cohen’s *h*

Public Information Campaign Advisory Committee Roster

S. Georgia Nugent, Campaign Chair and President Emerita, Kenyon College

Gregory Carroll, Vice President of University Marketing, Stetson University

Brian Eckert, Executive Director, Communications and Public Affairs, Washington and Lee University

Brad Harsha, Director of Admissions, Defiance College

Chris Kimball, President, California Lutheran University

L. Jay Lemons, President, Susquehanna University

Tom Morris, President, Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges

Michele D. Perkins, President, New England College

Carolyn J. Stefanco, President, The College of Saint Rose

Haywood Strickland, President, Wiley College

Karl Stumo, Vice President, Enrollment Management and Marketing, Dominican University (IL)

Eileen B. Wilson-Oyelaran, President, Kalamazoo College

Project on the Future of Independent Higher Education Steering Committee Members

Chris Kimball President, California Lutheran University (Chair)

Steven C. Bahls, President, Augustana College (IL)

Luis Maria R. Calingo President, Woodbury University

Ronald L. Carter President, Johnson C. Smith University

Roger N. Casey President, McDaniel College

Jeffrey R. Docking President, Adrian College

Margaret L. Drugovich President, Hartwick College

Elizabeth A. Fleming President, Converse College

Thomas F. Flynn President, Alvernia University

Christopher B. Howard President, Hampden-Sydney College

Todd S. Hutton President, Utica College

Walter M. Kimbrough President, Dillard University

Larry D. Large President, Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities

Paul J. LeBlanc President, Southern New Hampshire University

Mary B. Marcy President, Dominican University of California

John McCardell President, Sewanee: The University of the South

Kevin M. Ross President, Lynn University

Ed L. Schrader President, Brenau University

Elizabeth J. Stroble President, Webster University

Henry N. Tisdale President, Claflin University

Edwin H. Welch President, University of Charleston

John S. Wilson President, Morehouse College

Cynthia Zane President, Hilbert College



THE COUNCIL OF
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 320

Washington, DC 20036-1142

Phone: 202.466.7230 • Fax: 202.466.7238

www.cic.edu